

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXXII, 2.

WHOLE No. 126.

I.—HORATIAN URBANITY IN HESIOD'S WORKS AND DAYS.

Hesiod's Works and Days have served too long as a *corpus vile* for critical dissection. Such treatment cannot entirely kill the life of this sturdy old poet:

invenies eadem disiecti membra poetae.

But why tear him into fragments? Stimulated by Eduard Meyer's recent article on Hesiod,¹ and heartily concurring in his general attitude of conservatism, I would go farther still in this direction and try to show that the poem as we have it is substantially a unit. There may of course be minor corruptions or interpolations in the text, but the argument here presented does not need, for the chief points at issue, to assume any interpolation, and it declines, with some vigor, an emended text.²

¹Hesiods Erga und das Gedicht von den fünf Menschengeschlechtern, in Genethliakon Carl Robert . . . überreicht von der Graeca Halensis, Berlin, 1910, pp. 159-187. I arrived at the conclusions presented in this paper after reading Meyer's article and studying again the Works and Days. I have since examined some of the recent literature on Hesiod, and am interested in finding the unity of the poem maintained in the excellent dissertation of P. Waltz (Hésiode et son Poème Moral, Paris-Bordeaux, 1906) and in that of E. Lisco (Quaestiones Hesiodeae Crit. et Mythol., Gottingae, 1903, 48-62). On Waltz, see below, p. 158 ff. Lisco, following his master Leo, explodes Kirchhoff's theory, and gives a most careful analysis of the first half or so of the poem, showing how the parts are linked inextricably together. I am glad to find that he and Waltz have anticipated various of the details set forth below. The whole question is well treated by W. Fuss (Versuch einer Analyse von Hesiods Έργα καὶ Ημέραι, Borna-Leipzig, 1910) who agrees essentially with Meyer; but see below, p. 148, n. 5.

²The number and age of the MSS of the Works and Days justify this initial assumption. The case of the Theogony is different. The complete

Taking our poem, then, as the manuscripts give it to us, we inquire first for what occasion it was written. Our answer must be derived solely from the text before us; we have no other evidence. Here, it seems to me, is the situation as the poem sets it forth.¹

Hesiod and Perses had received each a share of their father's estate. But Perses, not content, appropriated a considerable amount besides, with the connivance of the Boeotian princes who presided at trials. The epithet 'gift-devouring', applied to these judges, explains why they were ready to favour Perses.² Hesiod accepted what was left him and tilled his little patch with success, while Perses fared no better for his unrighteous triumph of the moment. After wasting his portion, he applied to his brother, with considerable effrontery, to help him out. But Hesiod refused.³ Perses, in revenge, brought suit against his

MSS of this poem are late and these all go back to one archetype in which various interpolations may have been made and which, as Rzach rightly denotes, lacked the end of the poem. The closing lines do not, I believe, give a transition to the Catalogue of Women, as is maintained, for instance, in Christ, *Griech. Litteraturgeschichte*, 1910, p. 113; they are parallel, word for word, with verses 965 f. There the poet tells of mortal men whom goddesses visited. With v. 1021 he goes on to tell, doubtless, of mortal women whom gods visited. We should probably find *δοσαι* the first word of 1023. The Theogony has sufficient unity in the part preserved; a very important element in it is the exaltation of Zeus and the reign of righteousness, intellectual order and spirituality.

¹ I hardly need say that I accept the statements in the poem as referring to actual history. See Croiset, *Hist. de la Litt. Grecque*, I, 472. Gilbert Murray, *Hist. of Greek Lit.*, p. 53, calls Perses a lay figure.

² V. 37: *ἤδη μὲν γὰρ κληῖρον ἔδασάμεθ'*, ἄλλα τε πολλὰ | ἀρπάζων ἐφόρεις μέγα κυδαίνων βασιλῆας | δωροφάγους. The time distinctly antedates the period in which the poem was composed. The *ἤδη* with the aorist followed by the imperfect has, I take it, the face of a *cum inversum* construction in Latin; 'we had already received our shares, when you proceeded to take some more'. On this much of the passage I agree with Mair, Hesiod . . . done into English prose, 1908, p. xix.

³ V. 395: *ὥς καὶ νῦν ἐπ' ἐμ' ἦλθες· ἐγὼ δέ τοι οὐκ ἐπιδώσω | οὐδ' ἐπιμετρήσω*. 'Ἠλθες' refers, of course, to a time previous to the writing of the poem, but as *νῦν* shows, not to so early a time as that designated by *ἔδασάμεθα* and *ἐφόρεις* in v. 37. Since then, Perses has become a beggar. Besides the statement later in the poem (vv. 393-396), the implication is clearly made in vv. 30-34; see below, p. 134. We must therefore allow Perses some months at least in which to squander the property mentioned in vv. 37-38. The trial in question, then, cannot relate, as Mair thinks (*op. cit.*, p. xix), merely to the

brother; the case was to be tried before the same gift-devouring judges who had assisted him before.¹ Hesiod, urging his brother to settle the matter justly by private conference,² either sent to him, or read before an audience, all of the present poem, which he either then or later entitled 'Works and Days'.

Let us see if this account is not consistent with what the poem contains. If it can be proved that the work has essential unity, and was written for Perses before the trial, we must conclude that Horatian urbanity was an important element in Hesiod's temperament. The most of this paper must be devoted to an analysis of the poem, but only in this way may we approach our intended goal. On the other hand, a new estimate of the poet's character will help to establish the unity of the poem.

The poem opens with a solemn invocation (vv. 1-10) to the Muses and to the mighty Zeus, who can bring down the scornful from their seat and exalt the humble and meek. "Look on me and hear me", he cries, "and guide thou judgments justly; and to Perses³ I will speak a word of truth". These last words indicate the purpose of the poem. It begins on the plan of many an ancient work, as for instance the different books in Lucretius's *De Rerum Natura*; first comes some sort of invocation, here a prayer, and then the theme is announced. The appeal for a righteous judgment shows that the trial has not yet come off.⁴ The religious note sounded clearly in the opening lines will be heard at intervals throughout the poem.

original misappropriation of Perses. Just what Perses hoped to get from his brother by this second assault is nowhere stated. He may have had designs on all of Hesiod's part of the estate, or he may have claimed merely enough to pay his debts, to which the poet alludes in vv. 404 and 647. It was at any rate a critical situation for Hesiod, as the fable of the nightingale and the hawk implies (vv. 202-212).

¹ V. 39 (immediately after the quotation given above, p. 132, n. 2): οὐ τήνδε δίκην ἐθέλονσι δικάσσαι. The demonstrative τήνδε seems emphatic, and refers most naturally to the future. Mair well observes (op. cit., p. xx) of Schoemann's 'emendation' (ἐθέλοντι δικάσαν), which implies that the trial had already taken place, "an assumption at once more gratuitous and more at variance with the context can hardly be imagined". Just so Meyer, op. cit., p. 161, n. 2.

² V. 35: ἀλλ' αὖθε διακρινώμεθα νεῖκος | ἰθείησι δίκης, αἱ τ' ἐκ Διὸς εἰσιν ἄρισταί.

³ Reading Πέρση rather than Πέρση, the evidence of the MSS being uncertain. See Meyer, op. cit., p. 160, n. 1.

⁴ Well shown by Meyer, *ibid.*

Hesiod's first message to his brother (11-42) is a somewhat leisurely exposition, in the manner of gnostic poetry, of the meaning of 'Strife' (*Ἔρις*). There are two kinds, evil strife, which involves men in wars and feuds, and good strife, which is the clue to wealth. For "she rouseth even the inefficient man (*ἀπάλαμον*) to work. For when he that lacks work, looks on another who has wealth, she asks him to plough and sow and to keep well his house" (20 ff.).¹ Working, farming, and duties domestic and social, will be treated later on, as we shall see, under separate heads. Thus far, though the reference to the inefficient man carries a thrust, Hesiod has not addressed Perses directly. Turning now to Perses, he exhorts him to cleave to the good and forsake the evil strife. "For small time has he for quarrel and dispute who has not stored within his house a year's supply of the seasonable fruits that the earth brings forth, Demeter's grain. Should you have full stock of that, you² could then stir quarrels and contentions for the goods of others. But for you 'twill not be possible to do the same a second time". Perses, that is, may have enough left to bribe the judges on the present occasion, or can make satisfactory promises, but with his extravagant tastes, his fund for corruption cannot last forever.³ Clearly, Perses is as poor at this moment, that is before the trial, as the latter part of the poem makes him out to be.⁴ Hesiod now appeals to him to settle the affair privately, as Zeus and justice shall direct. He reminds him, in words I have quoted before,⁵ that they both received a share of the property, but that Perses had added to his amount unjustly, with the help of the "gift-devouring princes who are anxious to adjudge the present case. Fools they are, and know not that the half is better than the whole, nor that there is great profit in mallow and asphodel."

It is a splendid and magnanimous spirit that speaks here. Hesiod has suffered injustice and is probably to suffer more, from

¹ In the citations which follow I do not always aim at a complete translation. A paraphrase often saves time as it is both translation and interpretation. But the reader should consult the text in each instance, to see if the paraphrase is true to it.

² Again, Schoemann's 'emendation' of *ὀφέλλοις* to *ὀφέλλοι* in v. 33 is highly objectionable.

³ Just so, later on (vv. 401 ff.), Hesiod tells Perses that he may succeed twice or thrice at begging but not forever.

⁴ So Lisco, also, interprets vv. 30 ff. (op. cit., p. 49).

⁵ See above, p. 132, n. 2.

his own brother. In reply, he does not lay on the heavy flail of indignation, but invites the offender to reason the matter out with him. One weapon he has more effective than the flail; it is the sharp sword of urbane satire. Perses, the impoverished, the short-sighted, is made out more fool than knave, while the princes, who are plainly called fools, are treated not with an anathema but with a proverb, with an exhortation to Horatian contentment and the prescription of a familiar article of Horatian diet.¹ I detect in this introduction the more or less explicit mention of four main principles on which Hesiod is to base his appeal; Justice,² Work,³ Contentment⁴ and Religion.⁵

But before discoursing on these themes in detail, the poet inquires, in as leisurely a spirit as before why the gods have concealed the fruits of the earth (*βίος*) from man (43-212). So far from exploding in righteous invective, Hesiod is going into the philosophy of the matter. Had not the gods made agriculture so difficult, he declares, "you, by working for a day might easily have laid by enough for even an idle year. You might quickly have put up your rudder⁶ above the fire, and let the work of oxen and of patient mules go hang". But this glimpse of what Perses would doubtless consider a golden age must give place to the stern actuality of hard work. Zeus has begrudged mankind an easy livelihood because Prometheus cheated him. Zeus hid fire as well, but Prometheus stole it back. Hesiod had told the story of Prometheus before in his *Theogony*; he gives a somewhat shorter version here, repeating several lines and phrases from his earlier account.⁷ He draws the same moral

¹ Carm. i, 31, 15: me pascunt olivae | me cichorea levesque malvae.

² V. 36: ἰθείησι δίκης, etc.

³ V. 20 f.: ἐπὶ ἔργον ἐγχεῖν, etc.

⁴ V. 40 f.: πλέον ἡμῶν παντός, etc.

⁵ V. 36: αἱ τ' ἐκ Διὸς εἰσιν ἀρισταί. Cf. also the invocation, vv. 1-10. Lisco, op. cit., p. 50, shows the connection between this passage and the invocation and adds: his autem versibus [11-48] utrumque carminis argumentum quod ad Persen attinet significatur, scilicet: et iustitia et laboribus opus esse. quae differentia ad totius carminis structuram pertinet.

⁶ Why rudder? The Boeotian farmer was sailor, too; later the poet will devote a special section to the art of sailing. Note the likeness of v. 45: αἰψά κε πηδάλιον μὲν ὑπὲρ καπνοῦ καταθεῖο to v. 629: πηδάλιον δ' εὐεργὲς ὑπὲρ καπνοῦ κρεμάσασθαι. Lisco, op. cit., p. 49, aptly remarks: ergo hic iam (i. e., v. 45) utrumque carminis extremi argumentum significat, cum tempora et agriculturae et navigationis postea sit expositurus.

⁷ See Meyer, op. cit., p. 166.

from the myth that Horace does in Odes I, 3: Prometheus by his disobedience to the divine will, brought upon mankind all woe, in the person of Pandora. For before, in the early days of earth, men lived without ills or hard toil or grievous diseases,¹ but Pandora let all these calamities out of the box, leaving only Hope within.²

¹ V. 91 f.: νόσφιν ἄτερ τε κακῶν καὶ ἄτερ χαλεποῖο πόνου | νόσων τ' ἀργαλέων. The qualifying adjectives are important. Hesiod would by no means exclude work altogether. See below, p. 137.

² Waltz (*Revue des Études Grecques*, 1910, p. 49 ff.) revives Lebègue's ingenious theory that ἐλπίς means 'foreknowledge' (*préscience*). He concludes (p. 57): "Loin que l'Elpis s'identifie avec l'Espérance, c'est justement en la retenant prisonnière que les dieux nous permettent encore d'espérer". True enough, but can 'Ελπίς mean 'foreknowledge'? The definitions of Plato (*δόξαι μελλόντων*, Legg. 644 C) and of Hesychius (*προσδοκία*) to which Waltz appeals, certainly do not contain this idea. I agree with Waltz and others who regard ἐλπίς as one of the evils imprisoned in the box; that Hesiod could tinge the word with a sinister meaning we see from v. 500, where it refers to the idle visions of Perses and his like. Now man still has ἐλπίς, as he has Pandora and all that goes with her, but his possession of Hope differs from his possession of all the other evils in that they are everywhere dispersed and revealed but the nature of Hope is concealed. So Meyer takes this part of the myth (op. cit., p. 163), though he apparently regards 'Ελπίς as a good. Hesiod's profound idea is not inconsistent with a belief in the ultimate triumph of justice, as we may see from the myth of the ages (v. the discussion of Hesiod's pessimism, below, p. 140 ff.), but he heartily detests any gambling with the future. Hope is an evil for the idle Perses, and that is the chief point for Hesiod at the moment. In telling the story of Pandora before, he was interested in drawing a different moral, namely the reason for feminine perversity (Theog. 590 ff.); 'Ελπίς and the box do not appear at all. The interpretation I have suggested here would include the fact that man has not foreknowledge, as part of the Prometheus story (Plato, Gorg. 523 D) shows, but it attains this result without distorting the meaning of ἐλπίς (Croiset, *Jour. des Savants*, 1909, 474, rightly calls Lebègue's interpretation forced). We must keep to this, and remember too that Hesiod had before him a tangle of myths which he used for his own moral purposes. While his own thinking is straight and clear, he was bound to commit some inconsistencies with tradition. The athetizing of v. 99: αἰγίωχον βουλῇσι Διὸς νεφεληγερέταο is peculiarly senseless. Hesiod's personal theology is as grand and simple as that of Aeschylus and the prophets of the Old Testament; he must express it at every turn regardless of its relevancy to myth. He gets into almost ridiculous plights in telling the story of Zeus's deception by Prometheus (Theog. 550 ff.) and especially in attributing universal providence to the still embryonic Zeus (Theog. 465). But brackets and emendation will not help matters; the interpreter of Hesiod must get at his thought and distinguish it from tradition, not seek its explanation there. See Meyer's admirable remarks on this matter (p. 163).

There is no mention of Perses in this story;¹ naturally, Hesiod has lifted the subject to a plane from which personalities are excluded. But now addressing Perses (106), though not calling him by name, he bids him give heed to another legend, which will show that gods and mortal men are sprung from the same stock.² He has another purpose also in this second story, the transition to which has been indicated by his brief description of the happy times before Pandora (90 ff.). Thinking of the present plight of humanity, Hesiod determines to set forth at greater length the reasons of its degeneracy; but one idea will also be the kinship of gods and men.

The legend of the ages is not myth but parable. It has, like the story of Prometheus, a definitely pointed moral, and shows in many of its details the deliberate invention of the poet. Thus in the Golden Age (109-126), though life is easy and the earth bears fruits of itself, men till their fields with a will.³ Hesiod reads back a gospel of work into that primitive peace, not as Meyer says,⁴ because he is bound to think of man as a peasant, but rather because the gospel of work is a cardinal point in his philosophy. Indeed, by what right do we call Hesiod a peasant at all? He is at least a cultivated peasant, master of an Aeschylean theology⁵ and of a highly artificial vocabulary, which I question if Boeotian peasants understood. In the present poem, he is to all appearances, a land-owner, a gentleman farmer. He ploughed, but so did a certain noble in early Roman history. He also wrote poetry, as Cincinnatus did not do. Milton was not a peasant, and yet he finds work in Paradise for our first

¹ Col. Mure, *A Critical Hist. of the Lang. and Lit. of Ancient Greece*, 1850, II 386, suspects a touch of immediate allegory in the description of the wise Prometheus and the thoughtless Epimetheus, "who considered not what Prometheus told to him" (v. 86).

² V. 108: *ὡς ὁμόθεν γεγάασι θεοὶ θνητοὶ τ' ἄνθρωποι* has been athetized by Lehrs and many others, including Waltz, but Mair would retain it, and Meyer defends it vigorously; see below, p. 141. The views presented in this paper are not affected by either the acceptance or the rejection of the verse. I prefer to accept it, influenced by Meyer's arguments. May we not also find a *testimonium* in Macrobius, *Com. in Somn. Scip.* 1, 9, 6: *sed Hesiodus quoque divinae subolis adsertor priscos reges cum dis aliis enumerat* (i. e., vv. 121 ff.)?

³ V. 119: *ἡσυχοὶ ἔργ' ἐνέμοντο σὺν ἐσθλοῖσιν πολλέσσιν*. See Meyer's rendering (op. cit., p. 178): "sie aber bestellten die Felder ... willig (eifrig, *ἐθελήμοι* ...) und in Ruhe (ohne Streit, *ἡσυχοὶ*) mit vielen Edlen zusammen".

⁴ Op. cit., p. 178.

⁵ See above, p. 136, n. 2.

parents; there are no weeds in the garden, but Eve reminds Adam on more than one occasion that there is plenty of pruning to do.

This insistence upon the industry of primeval man strikes me as Hesiod's contribution to the myth of the Golden Age. He admires the piety and simplicity of that happy time, and has no desire for unnecessary toil and pain. But he is far from sentimentalizing the past, indulging in the tired peasant's dream of perpetual holiday. To Hesiod, life without work would not be a Golden Age; and he would also like to bring Perses to the same way of thinking.¹

There is another lesson for Perses in the story of the Golden Age. After the men of that time had perished, they became by the will of Zeus, "good spirits upon earth, watchers of mortal men, who watch over judgements and unrighteous deeds; clad in mist they wander everywhere over the land, givers of wealth; this kingly privilege likewise they have".² Perses should note,

¹ Part of Gilbert Murray's description of Hesiod impresses me as almost caricature: "There is no swing in the verses; they seem to come from a tired, bent man at the end of the day's work—a man who loves the country life but would like it better if he had more food and less toil" (Hist. of Anc. Greek Lit., 1903, p. 11).

² Vv. 124-125 (= 254-255): οἱ ῥα φυλάσσουσιν τε δίκας καὶ σφέτλια ἔργα | ἥερα ἐσ-
σάμενοι πάντη φοιτῶντες ἐπ' αἶαν are excluded by Rzach, Meyer (op. cit., p. 176)
and others. They are in the MSS, and the fact of repetition makes rather for
than against their genuineness; see below, p. 145. The only external proof
against them is that Plutarch (Moral. 361 B), Macrobius (Com. in Somn. Scip.
1, 9, 7) and Proclus (Com. in Hesiod., in Gaisford, Poet. Min. Graeci III 101 ff.)
do not notice the lines. But Plutarch and Macrobius, it seems to me, do not
need for their purpose to quote *in extenso*. Macrobius gives a metrical render-
ing into Latin from 122 to 126, but it is not exact; thus he has nothing for
ἐσθλοί (or ἀγνοί) or for ἐπιχθόνιοι, unless he is mistranslating that with
quondam homines which otherwise corresponds to nothing in these lines;
rather he is suggesting by this phrase the previous part of the description.
Proclus, I will grant, has a comment on v. 255, though none on 125; it may
be that the suspected lines were not in his MS of Hesiod. But one reason
why no notice should be taken of at least verse 124 of the οἱ clause is that its
meaning is virtually given in the preceding phrase φύλακες ἀνθρώπων. Those
words would mean, judging not only by v. 254, but by Theog. 735 (of the three
set to stand guard over the conquered Titans), not 'protectors' of men but
'keepers', 'watchers', 'inspectors'. If Proclus did not have the suspected
lines in his text, he read this meaning in φύλακες, as his comment δντας δὲ φύ-
λακας τοῦ βίου τῶν ἀνθρώπων, δαίμονας καλεῖ, παρὰ τὸ δαῖναι τὰ πάντα, ἢ μερίζειν τὰ
ἀγαθὰ καὶ κακὰ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις shows. Proclus also refers to Plato (δαίμονας

then, that a cloud of unseen witnesses surrounds the court-room, and that these are ready to punish villainy or, what would also appeal to Perses, to dispense wealth to the virtuous.

The account of the Silver Age (127-142) likewise seems almost biographical. In those days, says the poet, a lad grew to be an hundred years before leaving his mother, still playing games, the foolish child, and then after starting out in life, survived but a short time, such was men's violent transgression of one another's rights (*ὑβρις*) and their sacrilegious neglect of the gods. So Zeus hid them under earth. Though divinities (*μάκαρες*), they are mortal,¹ and degraded in class; yet after all some homage is their due.² This part of the legend, too, is largely Hesiod's invention.³ I venture the guess that Perses had been tied too long to his mother's apron strings; at any rate he lacked independence of character. When a weakling of this sort has to shift for himself, the only method of self-support that he can invent is to grab, like a child, for the property of others. That course, if practised by all members of society, would be the ruin of society.

A new type of degeneracy is presented. The men of bronze (143-155) illustrate another vice not alien to Perses' character. They engage in general war and descend nameless to Hades. More hopeful is the race of heroes that now succeeds (156-

δὲ τοὺς ἐφορῶντας τὰ ἀνθρώπινα, ὡς καὶ Πλάτων φησὶν; in Laws 713 C, as Gaisford points out, Plato declares that Kronos, knowing that human kind cannot of itself prevent πάντα μὴ οὐχ ὑβρεῶς τε καὶ ἀδικίας μεστοῦσθαι created divinities (*δαίμονες*) as rulers of cities. See Stallbaum, who refers to our passage (v. 111). Whether or not, then, verses 124-125 are genuine, their essential meaning is in the preceding phrase and Meyer's conception of the function of these divinities is wrong. Free dispensers of wealth "ohne Zutun der Menschen" would not, I am sure, win the approval of the moral Hesiod, nor would he be anxious to call Perses' attention to them. These guardians, rather, punish injustice and reward thrift; that makes a better lesson. Verses 124-125 are retained by Paley and Mair. Waltz adopts the questionable compromise of retaining 124 and bracketing 125.

¹ Peppmüller's *θυγατέρες* for *θυγατέρες* is another gratuitous emendation.

² Meyer (op. cit., p. 180) sees an inconsistency here in allowing any reward to these useless creatures. But something must be conceded to their lineage. Hesiod, it would seem, found this part in the tradition, and did his best with it.

³ See Meyer, op. cit., pp. 174 and 177. Apparently Meyer believes that Hesiod invented the story of the Silver Age altogether. Such a view, it seems to me, goes too far.

173). They are warriors too, but more just and noble; the Islands of the Blessed are their portion forever.¹ However, this ray of hope makes the iniquity of the Iron Age seem all the blacker. "Would that I had been born", the poet exclaims, "not in this Fifth Age of man, but either before or after". This were a childish utterance, if it stood by itself: "Any time but the present for me; let me fly to evils that I know not of". But the words help us to understand the puzzling intrusion of the Age of Heroes in Hesiod's otherwise gloomy account of human history. He does not believe, after all, that man has sped without a swerve down the ringing grooves of degeneracy. There are ups and downs; perhaps the next generation may come upon better times. Hesiod's eye is fixed not so much on historical evolution as on human character here and now; he could say of his poem, as truly as Dante, *subiectum est homo*.² The Age of Gold shows us righteousness and prosperity in union. The Ages of Silver and Bronze illustrate the immediate results of certain moral imperfections, laziness and arrogance. It is hard to trace any *development* from one period to the next.³ One age ceases and then, as though some cataclysm had intervened, the gods "make" another; that is Hesiod's formula. He presents to us, not the progress, or regress, of the ages, but a series of tableaux; not acts in a drama but scenes in a miracle play. Ovid's legend,⁴ which does not thrill with moral purpose, is much more orderly and genetic. Hesiod comes to history with the Age of the Heroes, who fought at Thebes and Troy. Those were times with which he must reckon and which were better than his own. His own times were admittedly bad; and yet he declares, "for all that shall good be mixed with evil". After the fifth age, however, Zeus shall add yet another, for which there seems little hope. The poet arraigns this coming generation in ardent words that Amos might have written. All family ties shall be broken, wrong shall rule at large, while Reverence (*Aidṓs*) and Righteous Retribution (*Némeis*) shall leave the world

¹ Vv. 169-169^a are surely interpolations; see Meyer, op. cit., p. 173.

² See Meyer, p. 180, for some excellent remarks.

³ I cannot see the reason for Meyer's statement (op. cit., p. 175) that the Iron Age represents the degeneracy of the Bronze as the Silver does that of Gold. There is no discoverable connection between the Ages of Bronze and Iron; the latter connects directly with that of the Heroes.

⁴ Met. I, 89 ff.

once and for all. Clearly Hesiod cannot have meant seriously his wish to be born *after* the Fifth Age, unless he wished for certain woe. We must interpret both this utterance and his final prophecy in the spirit of the other parts of his profound legend. For, again, he proclaims not so much a revelation of historical events, as a warning against moral consequences.¹ There is still some good in the world, and still some hope.² If we centre our attention on the ethical purpose of Hesiod and less on the historical framework in which he has set it, the inconsistencies in his treatment will cease to trouble us.³ They are there, but they do not affect the poet's main intention. Further, if we look again for a moment at what Hesiod announced as the theme of his myth, "how gods and mortal men are sprung from the same stock" (108), it yields an obvious moral. Not only men but gods, as the legend of the Gold and Silver ages shows, have need of work for their well-being.⁴ A somewhat similar undertaking appears in Horace's fourth ode of Book III, where the value of the spirit of poetry, that higher intelligence which overcomes brute force, is proved first for the individual, then for the state, and then for the gods themselves. It is interesting that this last idea is illustrated by the battle between gods and giants, so that both scene and motive may have been suggested to Horace by Hesiod.⁵ Meyer shows,⁶ by reference to the Theogony, that a familiar aspect of the Golden Age was the dwelling together of gods and men. If a poet were to describe that happy time he would begin with some allusion to this feature of the tradition. Hesiod so begins, but his meaning is novel. He is no dreamer who covets a life of godlike leisure; he would set both gods and men about their tasks.

I have referred in the title of this paper to the Horatian

¹ Meyer (op. cit., p. 186) finds in 190 f. a clear reference to Perses and the trial.

² This statement I would prove rather by v. 179 than by the story of Pandora and *ἐλπίς*. See above, p. 136, n. 2.

³ On such inconsistencies, see above, p. 136, n. 2, and also Meyer, op. cit., p. 170, n. 1.

⁴ Hesiod also involves gods and men in the same condemnation if they transgress the decrees of the Fates (Theog. 217-220), and gods are punished by Zeus for perjury (ibid., 783 ff.).

⁵ Certainly the reign of Zeus as described by Hesiod is one of spiritual order and refined intelligence. See vv. 886 ff., and above, p. 131, n. 2.

⁶ Op. cit., p. 168 f.

urbanity of Hesiod, and lest any should query how near to urbanity we are in the closing lines of the myth of the ages, I may point out that Horace, too, could at the needful moment speak out loud and bold in the fashion of an Old Testament prophet. The conclusion of Ode 6 of Book III is so despairing, that certain critics have imagined that the splendid series of odes, of which it is a part, were not written on a single plan. Though their unity cries out for recognition from the use of the same metre for them all and from the fact that the opening strophe of the first ode falls ridiculously flat if it applies only to this ode and not to the series, the objection has been raised¹ that the pessimistic close of the last ode precludes any intention of unity.

Damnosa quid non imminuit dies?
Aetas parentum, peior avis, tulit
Nos nequiores, mox daturos
Progeniem vitiosiore.

These lines are as dismal as anything in Hesiod; and the motive is precisely the same. Both poets intend not an historical forecast, but moral denunciation, in the hope that it may prove a spur to moral activity. The pessimism of the moment is sincere, but in neither case is it incompatible with a temperament essentially courageous and urbane.²

"And now I will tell a fable to the princes", declares the poet (202). Evidently the preceding fables must have been told to Perses. He has not been named in either of them for a long stretch of verses, but he is addressed at the beginning of the second myth (106), and the moral of both of them is pointed sharply at him. Hesiod's method is precisely the same in the following fable. He sets before the princes a picture of the gentle nightingale struggling in the talons of the greedy hawk. Without completing the simile, "even so you have your claws on

¹ E. g., Professor C. L. Smith, *The Odes and Epodes of Horace*, ed. 2, 1903, p. 190.

² Meyer, *op. cit.*, p. 165, remarks: "so hat er den Pessimismus, so tief er in seinem Gefühlsleben wurzelt, dennoch überwunden oder wenigstens zurückgedrängt: das Leben ist schwer, aber der Mensch kann es doch bestehen und durch energische Arbeit zu innerem Gleichgewicht und zur Gottergebenheit gelangen". Croiset I, 455: "mais avec cela, incapable de découragement". Waltz, *op. cit.*, p. 95: "mais c'est là un pessimisme assez superficiel", and in his edition, p. 53, "malgré son perpétuel mécontentement, il croit à la bonté de la vie, au triomphe définitif de la justice".

me", he leaves them, as he had left Perses before, to draw the inference; and the innuendo is more forcible than a statement.¹ The words would have no meaning if written after the trial;² written before, they bespeak a mind master of itself and serenely disdainful of consequences.

We come now to a passage (213-285) so different in colouring from the preceding that as an excellent critic of Hesiod remarked,³ one would imagine himself in the presence of another poet. But it is the same Hesiod returning to the gnomic manner of the passage on Strife which preceded the fables. It now looks as if Perses were to have his *haec fabula docet* after all. "Oh, Perses", he cries, "give ear to justice (*δικη*) and foster not insolent transgression" (*ὑβρις*). This is one of the burdens of the song of the ages, and justice is one of the four principles announced at the beginning of the poem. Hesiod develops it here in detail. The passage consists of maxims strung together somewhat loosely, yet having as much unity as a chapter in Proverbs which deals with a general theme. A closer glance, too, will show that the grouping is not so haphazard after all.

The poet begins then with an address to Perses; and now is the time, we should expect, for the vials of wrath. But Hesiod merely says: "Foster not insolent transgression. For transgression profits not a poor wight. It is a burden hard enough for a good man. Justice is better than transgression for those who follow it to the end; and the fool finds this out by experience". This, again, is the tranquil mood of the Horatian satirist which Hesiod showed at the start. Ridicule poured out placidly by one who keeps his temper may prove more scalding than irate denunciation. Meyer declares⁴ that Hesiod does not call his brother "foolish" (*μέγα νήπιε*) until the second part of the poem, written sometime later, when he could take the situation calmly. But by a not too subtle innuendo we can find the same meaning in the present lines, just as we have found it before.⁵

¹ See Lisco, *op. cit.*, p. 52, for a similar treatment.

² Thus the attempted emendation of v. 39 is of no profit to those (e. g. Waltz) who put the whole poem after the trial.

³ T. Stickney, *Les Sentences dans la poésie grecque d'Homère à Euripide* 1903, p. 68.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 162, n. 1. Meyer is quite right in stating that the epithet "ist keineswegs boshaft, sondern gutmütig".

⁵ See above, p. 135.

Sometimes it is quite as effective to call one a fool in the third person. At any rate, it is quite as urbane.

There follows a passage of deep feeling in praise of justice. Justice maltreated by "gift-devouring men who deal crooked judgements brings them doom,"¹ but to those who use her fairly, she sends peace and plenty". In fact a kind of Golden Age returns (225-237); "earth and woodland teem with their fruits, bees and sheep thrive lustily, wives bear children of like sort, men go no more to sea, but with good cheer tend the works that are their care". This last phrase:²

θαλίης δὲ μεμηλότα ἔργα νέμονται

takes me back to the men of the Golden Age,

οἳ δ' ἐβελημοί

ἦσυχοι ἔργ' ἐνέμοντο (v. 119)

and tells us again what that parable is about. As once the world lost its life of ease because it neglected work and fostered violence, so now the return is open for the peaceable and industrious. Virgil, too, in his Messianic eclogue declared that the Golden Age could be reproduced on this earth, and Horace caught up the strain in his somewhat belated tribute to Augustus

quo nihil maius meliusve terris
fata donavere bonique divi
nec dabunt, quamvis redeant in aurum
tempora priscum.³

In fact, in a similar description elsewhere, Horace may have had these very lines of Hesiod in mind.⁴

To reinforce his meaning, the poet now points to the opposite consequence; the promise of a Golden Age for those who do well is balanced clause by clause,⁵ but not too artificially, with a prophecy of evil for transgressors (238-247). There is careful art in this gnomic miscellany.

¹ Vv. 219-224, and cf. also the end of this passage, vv. 238-247.

² I adopt Mair's interpretation of *θαλίης*, which I think is borne out by *ἐβελημοί* and *ἦσυχοι* in vv. 118-119. See above, p. 137, n. 3.

³ Carm. 4, 2, 37 ff.

⁴ Cf. 4, 5, 33: *laudantur simili prole puerperae*, and *Works and Days*, 235: *τίκτουσιν δὲ γυναῖκες ἑοικότα τέκνα γονεῦσιν*, though of course coincidence in a common place like this may not be significant.

⁵ Contrast 227-228 with 242-243; 235 with 244; 236-237 with 247.

The exhortation to Perses is followed by one to the princes (248-274) just as in the preceding section they had been given a fable after the two that he had addressed to Perses. He warns them too to cleave to justice, for their actions are watched. "For there are upon the earth thrice ten thousand immortals of Zeus watchers of mortal men, who watch over judgements and unrighteous deeds; clad in mist they wander everywhere about the land" (253-255). These divinities, as the description shows, are simply those blest inhabitants of the Golden Age who died into immortality and became the guardian spirits of mankind. The solemn repetition of the very words used before adds force to the warning.¹ Thus this passage on justice is bound closely with the fables. Besides these watchful deities, the poet continues, there is the virgin Justice, who sitteth at her Father's hand, ever ready to take vengeance upon princes who wrest right judgements into false. Aye, that man plans evil for himself who plans it for another, for above all and seeing all is the awful eye of Zeus, which looks down even into our city and the manner of its justice (267-269):²

πάντα ἰδὼν Διὸς ὀφθαλμοὶ καὶ πάντα νοήσας
καὶ νῦν τάδ', αἱ κ' ἐθέλῃσ', ἐπιδέρκεται, οὐδέ ἐ λήθει,
οἷον δὴ καὶ τήνδε δίκην πόλις ἐντὸς ἐέργει.

It is tempting to think that Boethius had these verses in mind when he wrote the splendid words which end his *Consolation of Philosophy*:

"Magna vobis est, si dissimulare non vultis, necessitas indicta probitatis, cum ante oculos agitis iudicis cuncta cernentis".

At any rate Boethius might well have found in Hesiod an *anima naturaliter Christiana*.³

The exhortation to the princes ends characteristically: "May neither I nor my son be righteous among men, for it is idle to be

¹ See above, p. 138, n. 2. Virgil has the same effect in *Aen.* I, 530-533, where Ilioneus repeats what the reader later discovers are the very words of the oracle of Apollo (3, 163-166): est locus, Hesperiam Graii cognomine dicunt, etc.

² Or could τήνδε δίκην as in v. 39 refer specifically to the trial?

³ V. 267 in Hesiod suggests Homer's verse on the sun (*μ* 323, cf. *Γ* 227): δὲ πάντ' ἐφορᾷ καὶ πάντ' ἐπακούει which Boethius too applied for a theological purpose, *V m.* 2 init. Col. Mure, *op. cit.*, II 398 observes of Hesiod's maxims: "Some embody almost word for word fundamental dogmas of the Christian moral code".

a righteous man, if the unrighteous shall have the greater right of might". Here speaks the gloomy prophet of the fable. But he adds at once :

ἀλλὰ τὰ γ' οὐ πω ἔολπα τελεῖν Δία μητιόεντα.

The sudden change in sentiment is quite in the spirit of Isaiah.¹

"Therefore the Lord shall have no joy in their young men, neither shall he have compassion on their fatherless and widows. For every one is an hypocrite and an evil doer, and every mouth speaketh folly. For all this his anger is not turned away, but his hand is stretched out still".

With a final apostrophe to Perses, the passage on Justice comes to an end. "Beasts have not justice, but man is just. He who breaks his oath is visited with the vengeance of Zeus, but the generation of that man who abides by his oath is better in time to come".

Just here Meyer draws the dividing line between the earlier and the later poem. Even granting the correctness of this hypothesis, I find enough in the part already analyzed to justify the title of this paper. Hesiod has the moral sublimity of a Hebrew prophet. He feels deeply the evils of his times and denounces them with apocalyptic exaggeration; and so does Horace. But Hesiod's method of rebuking his brother is not to denounce him; it is rather to point out the folly of wrongdoing and shame him by ridicule. The princes, not unnaturally, he does denounce, and yet can treat them, too, with the milder derision:

"Fools, that know not that the half is better than the whole".

Part of the poem thus far is gnomic in character, consisting of moral exhortation, part is leisurely, philosophic reflection on man's development, or, rather, the consequences of his moral acts. If Hesiod could have written a work like this while the sentence of the court was impending, he could have added all the rest that we find in our text. Analysis will show that only a fragment of his idea is carried out in the part already examined.

Let us turn to the rest of the poem. It opens with a gnomic passage (286-382) which is distinct from the preceding² but does

¹9, 17.

²This fact is not observed by Mair in his translation, p. 11. The paragraphing in this otherwise admirable translation might be considerably improved.

not specially suggest the beginning of a new poem. "But I will speak to you with good intent, foolish Perses. Vice is easy and virtue hard; the gods have put sweat in front of it. But though the start is rough, the path is easy at the end. Give ear and I will tell you why. Worst of all men is he who will not follow advice. So first, the gods requite the industrious man and punish the sluggard. Work, then, Perses, scion of the gods" (298-309). For Perses, though senseless, is also, as the fable showed, sprung from the gods. The stock epithet may be intended as a rebuke to him for neglecting his birthright. "Men,¹ too", the poet continues, "as well as gods, will favour the industrious person who gains wealth, for the poor they hate. For work is no reproach, but idleness is shame (310-319). Get not your wealth by plunder", as Perses had done when the inheritance was divided,² "for such crime will class you with one who harms a suppliant, or seduces his brother's wife, or sins against the orphan and the aged. Zeus will requite all such (320-334). But rather pay your vows and offerings to the gods, that they may favor you, and that you may purchase another's inheritance and not he yours" (334-341). The allusion here seems pointed. "Keep on good terms with your neighbors. Entertain not your enemies, but do no harm to a friend. Let your dealings be just; gain naught unrighteously. Give to him that gives; give not to him that gives not". Perses must have found a certain sting in this golden rule; 'do unto others as I have just done to you'. "A gift is good, robbery³ is evil and dispenses death", that is, to the robber. "Who gives willingly, though he give much, feels joy. Who takes unjustly, though ever so little, is chilled at heart (342-360). Lay by, then, bit by bit, and soon you will have good store. When the cask is broached and when it fails, take your fill, but be sparing in the middle; 'tis niggardly to spare the less" (361-369). Here is much wisdom for the penny-wise and pound-foolish. "Pay your friend his promised reward, and smiling, set a witness even on your brother". Do not trust

¹ There can be no doubt as to the correct reading in vv. 309-310. Two classes of MSS, ψ and ϕ , and one MS, G, of class Ω have, correctly, *ἐργαζόμενος πολὺ φίλτερος ἀθανάτοισιν*, which connects at once with *έσσεαι* in the following line. *Ἐργαζόμενοι . . . φίλτεροι* is an easy error, in MSS C F H. Rzsch's text is curiously and wonderfully made in certain places.

² Ἀρπακτά in v. 320 suggests *ἀρπάγων*, v. 38.

³ Ἀρπαξ, cf. n. 2.

indiscriminately, that is. This smile, suggesting at once a "playful adherence to a useless form"¹ and a recognition of the inevitableness of human frailty, is peculiarly the sign of a wise, Horatian temperament.² "Trust not the harlot woman,³ for women are deceivers. Have a son or more to tend your estate. If there are more, employment is the more, and more the increase. If then your heart is set on wealth, so do; and work you work upon work" (370-382).

I have not done justice in the above paraphrase to the gnomic character of this section. It consists of proverbs, some longer, some shorter, that sing off easily like the adages in pastoral amoebaeon.⁴ But though the elements are in form disjointed, the whole is given unity by the central idea, which is announced at the beginning and summed up vigorously in the closing lines. The theme of this part of the poem is Work; we have here a companion piece to the preceding section on Justice. Here as there, ideas kindred to the main theme are grouped coherently enough, though not with the preciseness of a lawyer's brief. Work is the main theme, while piety, economy and the skilful handling of one's neighbors and one's household are appropriately associated with it. The tone differs slightly, but not essentially, from that in the passage on Justice. In that there is more earnestness, in this, a touch more playfulness; the reason lies in the different nature of the themes. Now Work, as we have seen, was one of the four main principles suggested at the beginning of the poem, Justice, Contentment and Religion being the other three. The conclusion is to me unavoidable that the passage on Work, no less than that on Justice, belongs with the poem as its author originally planned it. We cannot, then, with Meyer, mark off Part I with verse 285.⁵

The little discourse on Work is most closely connected with

¹ Paley, ad loc.

² Cf. the beginning of Sat. 2. 5 for a similar situation.

³ Mair's 'scarlet woman' comes as near as anything in English can to *πυγιστόλος*.

⁴ Lines like 557-558: *μεις γὰρ χαλεπώτατος οὗτος | χειμέριος, χαλεπὸς προβά- τοις, χαλεπὸς δ' ἀνθρώποις* would fit well in pastoral. Perhaps further study should be made of the gnomic element in the pastoral; if so, the subject should be approached in the spirit of that brilliant work of Dr. Stickney's cited above (p. 143, n. 3).

⁵ Fuss (op. cit., p. 63), though agreeing with Meyer that the work falls into two separate poems, would have the first end with v. 335.

the following passage. In fact the last sentence, just quoted, serves, in a way, both as finale and as introduction.¹ The concluding injunction to "work work upon work" is now made specific. The poet passes in review the chief labours that engage the farmer (383-617). This is the part of the poem which is most intimately associated with Virgil's poem and which has most contributed to the opinion, held by some critics, that the *Works and Days* is essentially a didactic poem of the georgic sort.² But these precepts are incidental. They are involved in the larger theme, "Manage your estate thriftily and you will get wealth". Further, it is not only the Gospel of Work in general, but the Gospel of Work for Perses;

ἐργάζεο, νήπιε Πέρση (397).

Hesiod's art of farming, then, is not purely didactic or technical, but didactic, gnomic and personal at one and the same time. Now as it is impossible to dissociate this part, as I believe Meyer would agree, from the passage on Work, and as that is bound up with what preceded, the end of 'Part I' is not yet in sight. Certainly nothing in the following words indicates the beginning of a new poem.

"Start reaping when the Pleiades rise, and ploughing when they set. Let this be the law for farmers wherever their land may lie, far from the shore or near it. Wear no cloak when you sow, or plough, or reap." That is, I take it, get in a condition to work with all your might.³ "Else you will have to beg of other men, even as now you came to me."⁴ But I will not give to you or dispense to you. Work, foolish Perses, the works that the gods have assigned to men if you would pay your debts and keep starvation from the door. Begging may succeed twice or thrice, but not forever (383-404).

"Now first get a house and a wife and a plough ox. Do not put off till the morrow, for procrastination, as surely as idleness, leads to ruin" (405-413).

¹ But it should not head a new paragraph, as Mair has it, p. 14. 'Ὡδ' ἐρθεῖν surely refers to the preceding, as it does in v. 760. See below, p. 154.

² E. g., Gilbert Murray, *op. cit.*, p. 56.

³ There is also of course in *γυμνὸν σπείρειν* the implication that these are employments of spring and summer when light clothing is needful. Later on (536-546), he describes the right clothing for winter.

⁴ See above, p. 132, n. 3.

"In autumn time, cut timber in the woods, and make your farming implements, especially the plough". Here the instructions are rather minute.

"Get you strong oxen and a steady hired man who can make his dinner of a loaf of four quarters and eight mouthfuls". Thus there is a certain liturgical promptness in his method of dispatching his food; he wastes no time at meals. "Let him be a quadragenarian, and hence not too fond of society" (414-447).

"The first cry of the crane is the sign for plowing to begin. If you have your oxen and plough all ready, you can begin. See that you have them. Try not to borrow, for you will be refused, nor think, like the man whose wealth is in imagining,¹ that you can make your plough then; for a plough is not made over night. So have it ready, and then to work with you, you and all your men. With a prayer to Zeus Chthonios and to Demeter, duly begin the ploughing, with a small boy to sow behind you and make trouble for the birds by hiding well the seeds. For order is the first law of the farm. Obey it and, Zeus willing, you can garner full sheaves and get the cob-webs out of your grain-vessels. Thus you will not look to others, but others will look to you (448-478).

"Plough at the solstice and you will reap sitting, holding but a little in your hand, dust-covered, not over rejoiced; you will carry your crop in a basket and few will look on in admiration. If late your sowing, wait till the cuckoo calls, and a good rain comes (479-492).

"Do not join the loungers at the blacksmiths on some wintry day when cold prevents men from work. See that you make provision for the wintry day and do not live on idle hopes like the lazy man, who lacking sustenance lays by in his heart a store of ills". Such then would be the result of Perses' latest stroke of high finance.

"Hopeful imagination² is not good for a needy man, sitting with the loungers and having naught at home. Be fore-armed. Even in midsummer have your granaries in readiness" (493-503).

"But shun the month Lenaion when Boreas blows in the icy

¹ This is Mair's rendering of ἀνὴρ φρένας ἀφνειός (455).

² On ἐλπίς, see above, p. 136, n. 2. Waltz (Rev. des Études Grecques, op. cit., p. 52) takes ἐλπίς ἀγαθή together and οὐκ as modifying the verb. This would certainly be an unnatural construction, and is rightly rejected by Masqueray, Rev. Crit., 1910, II 130.

woods and wild beasts shiver and put tails between legs; for he bloweth through the thickest of fur and sets the old man upon the run.¹ But he cannot blow through the sheep in the fold or the tender maiden sitting by her mother in the cheerful house on a day when the Boneless One (the cuttle-fish) gnaws his own foot in his fireless home, and the creatures of the woods look like a three-legged old man with a broken back, as they lope about in the snow" (504-535). This picture of the horrors of the cold should serve to scare Perses into activity while yet it is time.

"In winter wear the kind of clothes I tell you, a soft cloak and full-length frock, so that the hairs on your shivering body will not stand on end. Wear comfortable oxhide sandals lined with felt. Make you a rain-coat of goatskin and a cap for your head, so that your ears will not get wet; for dawn is cold when Boreas blows. So anticipate the storm, get your work done first and back to the house before you are soaked through. Winter is an unlovely time. Then should cattle get half-rations and men an extra supply. For the friendly nights are long" (536-563). I imagine that Perses did not need this elaborate description of comfortable clothing or of the effects of a cold storm upon the body; more unpleasant still must have been the gentle shower of ridicule that Hesiod pours on him in this passage. The formally didactic *ὡς σε κελεύω* and the parody of Homeric phrases add to the bitterness.²

"When Arcturus and the swallow usher in the spring, trim your vines (564-570). But when the House-carrier (snail) crawls on the vines to escape the shower of the Pleiades, sharpen your sickles for the harvest and keep your servants busy. In reaping time, hug not your bed at dawn. For dawn, dawn is the time to work if you would lay by a goodly store" (570-581). Perses evidently got up at some other time.

"In the hot midsummer, when work goes hard, that is the time for a little recreation in the shade of a rock with a bit to eat and drink, and a zephyr blowing in your face. Three parts spring-water and one part wine will make good beverage" (582-596). Again, this is advice that Perses did not need.

¹ Rather than 'bent', 'stooping'? So the alternative explanation in Proclus: *ἡ ὀξὺν ἐν τῷ δρόμῳ*.

² V. 536 *ἐρυμα χροός* (Δ 137), and v. 537 *τερμύβεντα χιτῶνα* (τ 242) are Homeric phrases. Paley, ad loc., "suspects" that the passage is "the work of an Ionic rhapsode". To a certain type of mind, humour always is suspicious.

"Comes threshing-time. Set your men at work, measure and store your grain. Then get a good head-man and a woman servant without a child. Treat well your sharp-toothed dog, lest the Day-Sleeper (that is, the Night-Prowler) steal your goods" (597-608).

"When Orion and Sirius have come into mid-heaven, then Perses, gather your grapes, and at the setting of the Pleiades, plow again" (609-617).

This completes the annual cycle indicated at the beginning of these instructions (383): "Start reaping when the Pleiades rise, and ploughing when they set". Just so the beginning and the end of the passage on Work (297-382) are bound together by the repetition of the main idea in the last line. The subject is treated with a fair amount of system, as befits a calendar. That part of the farmer's almanac is included which describes the tasks of the year in the order of occurrence. The information given by no means covers everything that the farmer needs to know; the object of the poet is by presenting both agreeable and disagreeable consequences to induce Perses to work. Perses is mentioned at the beginning of the passage and at the end, with an intervening stretch of over two hundred lines.

But the Boeotian farmer must know something about sailing, as Hesiod has already twice implied.¹ There follows a brief treatment of this art (618-694). "At the setting of the Pleiades tempt not the sea, but proceed to work your soil as I instruct you. Beach your boat, carry the tackling home and hang up your rudder above the smoke. Wait for good weather and then start out with a cargo and make money on it, as our father used to do, you foolish Perses. For he came all the way here from Cyme in Aeolis, fleeing penury, and got him a habitation in the miserable little town of Ascra (618-640).²

"So Perses, mind all works in their season, and especially sailing. Commend a little boat and put your cargo in a big one". Perses' neighbour might be induced by such commendation to put his wares in a little boat and hence take less to market. (641-645).

"If then you will turn your senseless soul to trade and desire

¹ Vv. 45, 388. See above, p. 135, n. 6.

² Waltz well remarks (in his dissertation, p. 134): "un simple tour de phrase donne parfois à un vers une naïveté pleine de malice". The meaning of 637 ff. is: "il ne faisait pas comme toi".

thus to escape your debts and cheerless hunger, I will show you the measures of the sounding sea—not that I am wise in the lore of sailing or of ships. The only voyage I ever made was to Aulis in Euboea and thence to Chalcis, where at the games of Amphidamas I won a prize for my hymn, a tripod that I offered to the Muses of Helicon, where they first set me on the path of song. I know no more of ships than that, but Zeus and the Muses will tell me how to sing of them" (646-662). What grounds had Plutarch¹ for objecting to this passage? I hope it is genuine; if so, we have a clear enough picture of how Hesiod spent his time. By profession he was a minstrel. He also owned a little farm. He wrote good poetry and managed his farm successfully. He stayed at home writing and ploughing, unless some contest summoned him to compete. This seems a simple and pleasant sort of existence which Horace would have liked.

"The summer months are the time for sailing. You will not suffer shipwreck then, unless Zeus and Poseidon be determined to destroy you. Avoid the late autumn, and wait in the spring till on the topmost branches of the fig-tree leaves appear in shape like the tracks of a crow. I fancy not spring sailing, for it must be snatched". The epithet *ἀρπακτός* applied to this dangerous art, makes it almost a form of thieving or gambling; and Hesiod does not approve high finance. "Put not all your substance aboard, for 'tis terrible to run the risk of ruin in the waves. Observe due proportion: the fitting time is always the best" (663-698). This is all of the passage on sailing. The revelation of the Muses has not been very specific.

The poem can hardly end here. The part that follows (695-764) is distinct and yet no definite subject is announced, as has been the case in all the main passages examined thus far. We find a miscellaneous array of maxims on man's social and religious conduct. The poet begins with marriage. There has already been mention of a wife, together with a good plough-ox and other necessities of the farm (405 ff.), but now her qualities are described. "When you are not much under thirty and are not much over, marry a maiden still in her teens. Let her be a neighbor's daughter, and discreet. For there is nothing better

¹As reported by Proclus. See Rzach (ed. Maior), ad loc. Waltz, edition, p. 11, seems inclined to accept the passage.

than a good wife and nothing worse than a bad one, who without a firebrand can singe a man (695-795). In making friends, do not go too far. Do not make a brother of your friend. If you do, then be not the first to give offence. If he offends you, give him twice as good as he sends, but if he wishes to make up a quarrel, forgive him". Other maxims on friendship follow, and then comes a series of religious injunctions and taboos. "Wash the hands before pouring libations and before crossing a stream. Do not put the ladle across the mixing bowl; for that is attended by a grievous fate. Nor when building a house leave it unplanned, lest the croaking raven sit on it and croak. If you chance upon burnt offerings mock not these mysteries; God is angry too at this". These specimens will suffice; the religious character of the precepts is apparent. The series ends with a line or two on Rumour, which one may avoid by doing as above prescribed. "For one must pay heed to Rumour; for Rumour is in a way divine".

Those who believe this passage a later addition point out, besides its miscellaneous character, the fact that the name of Perses nowhere appears either here or in the rest of the poem. But it had appeared in the preceding part on sailing, and, as we have seen, there is no clear line between these two parts. In fact we must consider more carefully what Hesiod meant by the special works which follow and illustrate his discourse on Work in general (286-382). His aim, as we found, is not solely to discuss agricultural and nautical operations, but by selecting typical tasks to point the morals of industry, economy and social common sense. *Ἔργα*, therefore, as especially the latter part of the passage on work indicates (342-382) means 'deeds', 'principles of conduct' as well as 'works'.¹ The last line of the passage is a good summary of both these meanings; *ὧδ' ἔρδειν* (i. e. the proper 'deeds') *καὶ ἔργον ἐπ' ἔργῳ ἐργάζεσθαι* (i. e. 'works'). The detailed account of 'works' we have in the following passages on Farming and Sailing. 'Deeds' are treated incidentally there, but more particularly in the concluding passages. At the end of the present passage the poet harks back to the appropriate phrase *ὧδ' ἔρδειν* (760). The failure to mention Perses becomes less significant when we appreciate how closely the

¹ So, too, in Theog. 902 f.; *Εὐνομίην τε Δίκην τε καὶ Εἰρήνην τεθαλύναν | αἱ ἔργ' ὠρεύνουσι καταθνητοῖσι βροτοῖσι*. The verb has a religious tinge in Theog. 416 f.; *ὅτε πού τις ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων | ἔρδων ἱερὰ καλὰ κατὰ νόμον ἱλάσκηται*.

passages on Work, Farming, Sailing and Social and Religious Conduct are bound together. Within the larger unity of the poem they form a group of over 450 verses; of these the passage on Conduct has but seventy. It should also be noticed that the religious precepts illustrate one of the four principles suggested at the beginning. Various pious utterances have appeared before, but here is a definite collection of maxims devoted to religion. Finally, as regards the miscellaneous character of this and other collections in the poem, it is worth noting that Virgil, who was something of an artist, took no offence at it, for he imitates the effect in two passages in his *Georgics*.¹

The last of the main sections of the poem is that on Days (765-825). The keynote is set in the opening line. "The Days that come from Zeus keep well, and duly tell them to your servants". The precepts are religious, like those in the latter half of the preceding section.² These prescribe what deeds should or should not be done; these tell when certain deeds are best done. If the preceding passage be admitted as part of the original poem, it is hard to rule this out. Taken together, they illustrate the idea of religious duty, the necessity of which was strongly emphasized at the beginning of the poem. The passage on Farming has something of the chronological nature of the present part, for it considers works in the order of the calendar. But here the treatment is more minute; each day of the month is lucky or unlucky for some special thing. Thus Hesiod gave instructions before about the general time for sowing, but now adds that the thirteenth day of the month is a bad day to begin the sowing, though excellent for setting out plants. To quote a few more specimens. "The eleventh and the twelfth are good for shearing sheep, the sixth is a kindly time for building a pen, the fourth for taking a wife to your home; and few know that the twenty-seventh is the time for broaching a jar and yoking up your beasts of burden and launching your boat". I cannot review these superstitions in detail, but they appear to be part and parcel of the farmer's life, altogether as important as an

¹1, 176-203; 2, 298-314. Book I of the *Georgics* is modelled with the utmost deliberation on Hesiod. Virgil at once pays homage and offers challenge to his master and ultimately transcends him. See below, p. 165, n. 1.

²See Mair, pp. 104 ff., 110 ff., 162 ff., and Waltz (dissertation), pp. 69 ff.; (edition) pp. 19 ff.

intimate acquaintance with the parts of a plough. Agriculture was still the handmaid of theology; only a theologian could really plough. If Hesiod set about to give his brother, I will not say complete, but even sufficient instruction in the art of successfully managing a farm, he could not, with his deeply religious temperament, omit these precepts. Though Perses is not named, this section connects closely with the preceding, and that with the part before.

Considering everything after verse 285, we can well see why Meyer regards this part as a complete poem written for a definite occasion. No more appropriate title could be devised for it than *Works and Days*. It falls into the following five parts: General Precepts on Industry and Economy, Precepts on Farming, on Sailing, Social and Religious Precepts, Days. I cannot conceive that the scheme would be complete with any one of those gone. But beginning with the other end of the poem, we have seen¹ that it is impossible not to include the passage on Work with that. The natural conclusion is that both parts form one poem of definite scope and purpose. The main principles on which the poet bases his appeal are stated at the beginning, and all but one are elaborated in special sections. The one principle not thus treated, Contentment, is incidentally involved in all the others. Another subject, Social Duties, is only vaguely suggested at the beginning,² but receives occasional treatment in various of the main passages and occupies part of the passage preceding that on Days. It develops naturally out of the passage on Work, with its specific illustrations, for *ἔργα* means not only Tasks, but Deeds or Principles. As in all artistic creation, the poem avoids at once loose irrelevancy in construction and a too mathematical rigidity. The plan is completed by an admirable summary³ in just three lines at the end:

"So a man becomes happy and wealthy who knowing all these things works, blameless in the sight of the immortals, minding their omens, and eschewing transgressions".⁴

¹ Above, pp. 148 ff.

² Vv. 20 ff. See above, p. 134.

³ So Waltz (edition), p. 14. He states (*ibid.*, p. 16) the "quatre questions" as "justice, travail, piété, relations sociales".

⁴ Vv. 826-828: *τάων εὐδαιμόνων τε καὶ δλβιος, ὃς τάδε πάντα | εἰδὼς ἐργάζεται ἀναίτιος ἀθανάτοισιν, | ὀρνίθας κρίνων καὶ ὑπερβασίας ἀλεείνων.* *Εὐδαιμόνων* suggests Contentment; *ὃς τάδε πάντα εἰδὼς ἐργάζεται* Works (and Deeds); *ἀναίτιος ἀθανάτοισιν* both Justice and Religion; *ὀρνίθας* Religion again, and especially the

This is the life of a man who steers his course by Contentment, Work, Justice and Religion. These verses bind beginning, middle and end into one consistent whole. There is roughness at the junctures of the main parts and lack of sequence in the details of the gnomic passages, but a central idea with subordinate ideas has been planned and successfully set forth.

This analysis of the poem, I am convinced, is confirmed, not shattered by a consideration of rival hypotheses. I select three recent utterances as typical. That of Meyer I have already examined. A ferocious onslaught on the unity of the poem is made in the last edition of von Christ's *Griechische Litteraturgeschichte*.¹ It is there declared that all parts of the poem which do not mention Perses are later additions, presumably having nothing to do with him at all. The remainder consists of two poems, both addressed to Perses, one, apparently, before the trial, the other at some later time. Let us see how the actual details fit into this scheme.

The first poem to Perses is supposed to include vv. 11-48 and 213-316. The first of these sections includes the passage on *Ἔρις* and just the beginning of the Prometheus story. The last lines would be (47-48):

ἀλλὰ Ζεὺς ἐκρυψε χολωσάμενος φρεσὶ ἦσιν.
ὅττι μιν ἐξαπάτησε Προμηθεὺς ἀγκυλομήτης.

This makes a sudden ending. Why not add the next line,

τοῦνεκ' ἄρ' ἀνθρώποισιν ἐμήσατο κήδεα λυγρά?

Perhaps the author of this theory felt a danger in so doing, as the phrase might well refer to something about to follow. Surely, if that is so, and you include only the beginning of v. 50 *κρύψε δὲ πῦρ* you must go on to the end of the story.

detailed precepts of the concluding passages; *ὑπερβασίας ἀλεείνων* both Religion and Justice, though perhaps the latter idea is more prominent; cf. Theog. 217-220: *Μοίρας . . . αἱ τ' ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε παραιβασίας ἐφέπονσιν*. Even supposing, as Proclus in his scholia states (see also Christ, op. cit., p. 116), that v. 828 may have been appended to form a transition to the *Ὀρνιθομαντεία*, the phrase *ἀναίτιος ἀθανάτοισιν* might suggest both Justice and Religion. But Proclus's suggestion is too bold even for Rzach (cf. also above, p. 131, n. 2, on the ending of the Theog.). See Paley's note, ad loc., and also that of Waltz, who aptly remarks that *δρυνθας κρίνων* means here 'observing the rites' and completes the summary of the poem.

¹ 1910, § 68 (pp. 114 ff.).

The other section (213-316) includes the passage on Justice (213-285) and part (286-316) of that on Work. But we have noticed that in the first of these, there are two evident references to the Myth of the Ages (225 ff.; 252 ff.); at least these two passages gain distinctly in intensity if they presuppose the myth. The part of the passage on Work is made to stop for no cogent reason at 316.¹ Poor Hesiod's attempt at a finale, which in all conscience is clear enough,

ὦδ' ἔρδειν καὶ ἔργον ἐπ' ἔργῳ ἐργάζεσθαι (382),

makes no impression on the higher critic. Of course it would be dangerous to keep on to this finale, for then it would be hard not to add the passage on Farming.

The "late additions" are the passage on Farming (383-617), with a segment of the introductory part on Work (317-382), the passages on Sailing (618-694), Social Duties (695-764) and Days (765-828), the fable of Prometheus (49-104) and the fable of the Ages (109-201). But again, if you accept *all* the passage on Work, the succeeding passages link themselves at once with it, while the first fable answers a question raised in the preceding part (v. 40 ff.) and the second is deliberately connected with the first by verses 106-108 (*ἕτερόν τοι ἐγὼ λόγον ἐκκορυφώσω*, etc.). These verses the critic simply scratches out. There are also scratched out, apart from lesser interpolations, verses 202-212, the fable to the Judges. This last² is certainly incriminating matter, for it contains the implication that the preceding fables were addressed to Perses. One portion which von Christ³ had deleted, as "ein elendes Flickwerk", namely the invocation (1-10), is now declared genuine,⁴ but the statement made in the former edition is retained, that "eine vollkommene Einheit bilden die 828 Verse des Gedichts in keinem Fall".⁵ I cannot help thinking that in such an analysis as this, hypercriticism reduces itself to an absurdity.

A third hypothesis is that of Pierre Waltz, in his dissertation on Hesiod⁶ and his edition of the Works and Days. He

¹ No more compelling is the hypothesis of Fuss that Poem I ends with v. 335. See above p. 148, n. 5.

² In the preceding edition of 1905 (p. 97), it is included with 213-316.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ed. of 1910, p. 115.

⁵ Ibid., p. 114.

⁶ See above, p. 131, n. 1.

presents what seems to me a convincing argument for the unity of the poem, only that by accepting Schoemann's emendation of verse 39, he thereby assumes the time of writing as after the trial.¹ But emendation of so important a passage is highly suspicious,² and besides, does not dispose of other passages which most naturally imply that the trial is yet to take place.³ Combining Waltz's argument for the unity of the poem with Meyer's treatment of verse 39 and the whole portion which he thinks an earlier poem, I would conclude that the poem is a unit and that it was written before the trial. I would return, that is, to the old-fashioned reading of the poem. Such orthodoxy has become to-day, I am aware, the vilest heresy; the theory of Göttling, which according to Colonel Mure⁴ was random conjecture and ought never to have been admitted to Smith's Dictionary of Classical Biography, has won such a place that even French critics have bowed to it. The brothers Croiset, who in their earlier work,⁵ denied the possibility of extracting "later additions" from the poem, and accepted its "unité primitive", have advocated in their later abridgement⁶ an hypothesis which seems half-way between the views of Meyer and of Christ. Masqueray declares, in a review of Waltz,⁷ that while one may not go the length of Fick's or Kirchhoff's analyses, it is just as reprehensible to fly to the other extreme and accept the unity of the poem. But such a *via media* as Masqueray's merely illustrates the obsession of fashion. If there is evidence against the unity of the poem, we must examine it, but the hypothesis that the poem is a unit is not an extreme, but our proper starting-point.⁸

¹ Dissertation, p. 43; edition, p. 91.

² See above, p. 133, n. 1.

³ See above, p. 133, n. 4, on the invocation (1-10), and p. 143, n. 2, on the fable of the nightingale and the hawk (202-212).

⁴ Op. cit., II 396, note, and in general, II 383 ff.

⁵ Histoire de la litt. grecque, edit. 2, 1896, I 469 ff., esp. 475. This volume is by Maurice Croiset, but it presumably represents the opinion of both authors.

⁶ Manuel d'hist. de la litt. grecque, 1900. See the seventh ed. (which mentions both of Waltz's works), p. 91 ff.

⁷ Rev. des Études Anc., 1908, 99. See also Rev. des Études Grecques, 1908, 142, where he remarks that the unity of the poem "n'est démontrable que grâce à un excès de bonne volonté". Apart from this matter, Masqueray gives Waltz's book high praise.

⁸ I have found few reviews of Waltz outside of France and Belgium. His works are not noticed in the last edition of Christ's Litteraturgeschichte. Of the French critics, Cuny (Rev. des Études Anc., 1909, 280 ff.) is non-com-

I have spent the greater part of this paper in an attempt, not gratuitous at the present moment, to assert the unity of Hesiod's *Works and Days*, but the point upon which I would have the argument converge is the definition of the poet's temperament. When he can be described by an appreciative critic of Greek literature¹ as the "type of the grumbling farmer in any age", who shows "an embittered egotism in all the relations of life", there is still room for restatement. We must ponder again as to just what Hesiod's feelings were when he wrote this poem to his brother at a critical moment. Once more, he is morally aroused, but he does not belabour Perses with the cudgel of a righteous wrath. In Dryden's words,² he exposes the folly of the man without arraigning his vices; he adopts, in a word, the method of Horatian satire. The moral of contentment and industry is also Horatian, and Horace never put it more neatly than in the maxim that the half is better than the whole. In one aspect, then, as we have seen,³ the poem seems gnomic rather than technically didactic. Hesiod is not so much interested in discoursing on the art of farming as in inducing Perses to work. There are distinctly both strands in the poet's woof, and many a reader may find that they do not match. The reproof of an unjust and ungrateful brother loses something of its effect when combined with detailed instructions to a supposedly docile farmer. We are not doing Hesiod justice if we do not recognize this contradiction, but we do him still greater injustice in removing it off-hand by the easy hypothesis of later revisions or interpolations, by whittling down a mighty temperament to suit the capacity of average common sense. By recognizing in the poem a vein of Horatian urbanity, we shall see that the two apparently discordant elements merge in a larger harmony. Hesiod wishes to give advice as well as reproof; leisurely didactic exposition pointed by sly thrusts of satire may fittingly accompany a moral protest. Take Horace's apology for satire;⁴ his aim is at once to define the nature of satire, to defend himself against certain

mittal as to the unity of the poem, while Croiset and Masqueray, as we have seen, do not accept it. It is accepted, apparently, by Labaste (*Rev. des Études Grecques*, 1908, 477), by a reviewer in *Rev. de l'Instr. Publ. en Belg.* (1909, 332 f.), and by J. Sitzler (*Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1910, 1467).

¹ Mrs. W. C. Wright, *A Short Hist. of Greek Lit.*, 1907, pp. 58, 59.

² Discourse Concerning Satire, in his *Poetical Works*, ed. G. R. Noyes, Cambridge, 1908, p. 283.

³ See above, p. 149 f.

⁴ Sat. I, 4.

admirers of Lucilius, gently to poke fun at them, and to commend the lessons in morality given him by his father. This satire is of course not an exact parallel to Hesiod's poem, but it illustrates a similar harmony of diverse moods. Considering Horace's temperament as a whole, we have seen¹ that his urbanity is not incompatible with a sincere, if momentary, pessimism, which has its counterpart in Hesiod too.

For a bland Horatian satirist a well developed sense of humour is essential. Hesiod had this, and likewise that sympathy, with which as Thackeray remarked, satire must walk arm-in-arm. There is nothing uproariously funny in the *Works and Days*, but there are all manner of delightful descriptive touches, at once humorous and sympathetic, especially in the passages on Farming and Sailing. Mure² and others have noted his quaint habit of coining epithets for men and beasts in stead of the names that convention has given them; thus the ant is called 'The Provident', the snail 'The House-carrier', the cuttlefish, 'The Boneless One', the burglar, 'The Day-Sleeper'. The same spirit is at work in many of the descriptions, as in the lines on the quadragenarian hired-man and his systematic meal (441), on the small boy planter who disappoints the birds (469), on the dust-covered reaper, mad at his luck (481), on the old man set running by the cold (518), on the freezing animals loping about on three legs (533), on Perses' goose-flesh (539), on the little 'House-carrier' crawling to the shelter of the vines to escape the rainy Pleiades (571), on the advantage of commending a small boat and putting your wares in a big one (643). Such descriptions, of which other examples might be cited,³ are not at all unlike the vivid little pictures with which Horace brightens his satiric discourses here and there. A writer who can treat details thus pleasantly might interpret a larger situation in the same way.

We must infer that he has done so if the unity of the poem has been proved. Satiric and humorous touches in the *Works and Days* have often been pointed out before,⁴ but they will throw a

¹ See above, pp. 141 f.

² Op. cit. II 393 f.; also Waltz, dissertation, p. 571, edition, p. 31.

³ E. g., vv. 475, 524, 585, 679; Theog. 35, 769.

⁴ Especially by Waltz, e. g., edition, p. 28: "les allusions satiriques, tantôt d'une bonhomie malicieuse, tantôt plus âpres et plus mordantes"; dissertation, p. 131; "le poète ne peut faire aucun retour sur lui-même et sur son entourage sans qu'une intention satirique se mêle à ses préoccupations de moraliste". See also above, p. 152, n. 2.

new light on the poet's temperament if we consider them in relation to their setting. We must find in Hesiod a lordly magnanimity as well as sound common sense if he wrote all of his poem before the trial, aware that the object of his satire might prove the future owner of his estate. Suppose that *faenerator Alfius* had had similar designs on the Sabine farm. I will not say that Horace would not have stood the test, but he would have needed what we may now call a Hesiodic urbanity to help him through. Just what the suit was, except that it was something critical,¹ or how it was settled, we do not know; more important for our consideration are Hesiod's feelings at the time.

This, then, is the poem with which Hesiod answers his brother. If we may now make a final attempt at definition, we cannot call it technically didactic, though it contains technical elements; it has likewise gnomic and personal and narrative elements.² Its main object is to present to his erring brother, in the abstract and the concrete, those principles which lead to a happy and successful life. It suggests a philosophical essay, something like Seneca's *De Vita Beata*, or Cicero's *De Senectute*, in which latter work the part on agriculture³ occupies about the same relation to the whole that the passage on the same subject does in the *Works and Days*. The nearest analogue in poetry to our work is moral satire; no single one of Horace's satires is closely parallel, but you can extract from all of Horace's works bits that are closely akin. Perhaps we should say that Horace has been gathering crumbs from Hesiod's table, though Quintilian's assertion⁴ still is true that *satura quidem tota nostra est*. Hesiod was perhaps not aware that he was writing moral satire. If he reflected at all on literary types, he regarded the present work as catalogue poetry, of which, according to antiquity, he wrote other specimens. Hence the wholly admirable title, "*Works and Days*".

¹ See above, p. 132, n. 3.

² Waltz, edition, p. 16, calls the work "ni un poème didactique objectif, ni un traité de morale d'une portée universelle; Hésiode ne perd jamais de vue le point de départ de ses préceptes, ses démêlés avec son frère". This definition certainly makes of the poem too personal an affair, as Masqueray has well pointed out; *Rev. des Études Anc.*, 1908, 98-99; *Rev. Crit.*, 1908, I, 141. I should say rather that the poem *is* a moral and didactic treatise of general bearings *and* intended particularly for Hesiod's brother.

³ 51-59.

⁴ 10, I, 93.

A point that has influenced the disruptive critics is, as we have seen,¹ the fact that in the two concluding sections of the poem, Perses is not named. Now that the whole sweep of the poem is before us, I would revert to this matter and inquire whether it is at all surprising. It is natural that a work of apologetic nature should begin with the personal and concrete and end with the general and abstract. Thus Boethius in prison first seeks the consolation of philosophy for his own wrongs and then develops this consolation into a theodicy. Just so the last part of Hesiod's poem is more general than the first. But even in the first part the tone is not wholly personal. In the fable of Prometheus, which is as long as the passage on Days (64 verses), Perses is not called by name, nor do we know, as we read, that 'you' in vv. 106-107, means him. We think that it may, and on reaching the fable to the Princes (202) we infer that it must, but until that point, for a stretch of 90 verses more, in which the fable of the Ages is told, no mention is made of Perses; the two fables occupy considerably more space than do the passages on Social Precepts and Days (134 verses). Hesiod changes his tone, then, throughout the poem, according to the nature of his subject.

We may find a further reason for these shifts if we assume that Hesiod read his poem to an audience. Meyer declares, with refreshing boldness,² "dass Hesiod mit der Feder gearbeitet hat, und zwar so intensiv wie nur je ein Gelehrter". Doubtless, but we know also, unless we scratch out verses 654-662 that Hesiod took part in contests of poetry. M. Croiset,³ believes that his poems were always intended for recitation, and that the *Works and Days* was presented piecemeal to different audiences. I do not suppose that the poem was written at a sitting; it shows the results of considerable pondering and of experimentation with radically different literary types. I can conceive that parts of it had been written for purposes other than the rebuking of Perses, and were adapted to the new plan; one sure instance is the story of Prometheus, which he had already told, with a difference, in the *Theogony*. But whatever the genesis of the poet's thought and tentative expression, the poem as we have it was composed, I believe, for a definite occasion, the trial, and was finished before the trial came off. Imagine a gathering of people from Ascrea and the neighbouring villages; Perses and the gift-devouring

¹ Above, p. 154.² *Op. cit.*, p. 168, n. 1.³ *Op. cit.*, I 475 ff.

judges are among them, wondering what the poet will find to say. Or if we suppose them absent, the imagination of the poet can summon them to the place. He thus has various auditors to address, or, at least, various tones to assume. Waltz remarks acutely:¹

"L'enseignement d'Hésiode avait perdu toute chance de succès, si une excessive sévérité dans l'expression avait rebuté ses naïfs auditeurs".

Those remarks carry all the more weight if the scene is laid before the trial. The recitation would have the impressiveness of drama, and like a drama, would depend for part of its effect upon changes in tone, in literary form and in modes of address; now there is a solemn appeal to Zeus, now a word of warning to Perses or of defiance to the princes, now a thrust of satire for them both, now a fable with a moral for them and for all. The poem ends with something like liturgy, which is expressed, as is right, in general not personal terms. This alternation between the general and the personal is, again, dramatic and effective; though not arranged in any definite system, it resembles the change from chorus to dialogue in a play. On the same principle of contrast, too, the scene shifts in epic from the battle-field to Olympus and back.

To conclude, I would abide by our text and accept the poem as a unit. Though the author may have written parts of it long before, he composed before the trial a work essentially new and, most probably, read it to an audience which, in reality or in imagination, included Perses and the Princes. Under the circumstances, the kind of retaliation that Hesiod made for his brother's wrongdealing bespeaks a calm and lofty mind. Hesiod's temperament is rich in moods, but is not for that reason disordered.² He has moments of prophetic fervor, of sturdy hopes and sturdy despair, but such a poem could have been written at such a time only by a man who, master of himself and of his future, could

¹ Dissertation, p. 135.

² M. Croiset, *op. cit.*, I 486 says admirably of Hesiod's qualities: "l'accent personnel d'Hésiode est fait de rudesse, de familiarité, d'ironie mordante, de bonhomie, d'amertume, de grâce sérieuse, en un mot d'une foule de choses contradictoires, qui parfois éclatent en lui toutes à la fois", etc. So Waltz, dissertation, p. 137, speaks of "ce perpétuel mélange de majesté et de bonhomie", etc. On p. 81 he notes such qualities as "la franchise, la prévoyance, la modération, la discrétion".

treat his antagonists with the placidity of an Horatian satirist. In the "miserable little town of Ascra", far back in the history of Greek letters, we find the same genial raillery and wise urbanity, the same moral earnestness, too, that later shed their pleasant light upon the Sabine farm. Virgil, who in the first book of his *Georgics*, took Hesiod for his model in a fashion still imperfectly understood,¹ had long before penetrated deeply into the spirit of the *Works and Days*. For in his *Culex*² he calls that shepherd who follows with devotion the poet of Ascra, not an embittered egotist or grumbling farmer, but one who

securam placido traducit pectore vitam.

E. K. RAND.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

¹ In brief, the first half of Bk. I, after the invocation is *Ἔργα*, most of the second half is *ἡμέραι*; at the end Virgil catches up the Hesiodic strain into epic. Virgil, despite Conington, knew what he was about when he spoke of 'singing the song of Ascra through the streets of Rome' (*Georg.* 2, 176).

Waltz, diss., p. 107, speaking of Virgil, finds nothing idyllic in Hesiod. There is nothing romantic, but both Virgil and Hesiod prized contentment, and both had a vision of a very similar golden age. I am confident that we need a new study of Hesiod's influence upon the Roman poets, especially Virgil and Horace.

² *Vv.* 94 ff.

II.—LATIN INSCRIPTIONS AT THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

VI.¹

This article is devoted to a part of the sepulchral inscriptions of the Johns Hopkins collection. Except where a definite statement is made to the contrary all of them are of Roman origin.

48. Slab of white marble 0,31 m. wide and 0,56 high with the following inscription:

D M
A E L I A E · P · F ·
P H O E B E S
Q V A E · V I X · A N N · X ·
M E N S · I I · D · X X I ·
P · A E L I V S · P H O E B I O N · E T
A E L I A · I A N V A R I A · P A R E N
T E S · F E C E R · A N I M V L A E · D V L C ·
H I C · A N I M A · D V L C I S · T E R R A · T E G I T V R

The letters are well and deeply cut and in some cases still preserve traces of minium. This stone seems to have come from the same burial place as VI, 10948, which was found "in vinea Naria via Salaria" (Marini) about 1741-42: d. m. s. | Aeliae *p.* fil. Phoebes | quae vix(it) ann(os) x, m(enses) ii, d(ies) xxi. | P. Aelius Phoebion et Aelia | Ianuaria, parentes, filiae | dulcissimae fecerunt et | sibi et suis libert(is) libertabusq(ue) | posterisque eorum. h(uic) m(onumento) d(olus) m(alus) a(besto). | In fronte p(edes) vii; in agr(rum) p(edes) vii s. This is of course the general stone for the whole lot, whereas our inscription marked only the resting place of little Aelia Phoebe. Another Aelia Phoebe appears in VI, 10949, but she was a daughter of one T. Aelius. The use of *animula* as a tender epithet for the dead is not unusual and is found with *dulcissima* in VI, 7947. Still more common is *anima*, especially with *dulcis* and *dulcis-*

¹The preceding articles of this series appeared in this Journal, XXVIII, 1907, pp. 450 ff.; XXX, 1909, pp. 61 ff., 153 ff.; and XXXI, 1910, pp. 25 ff., 251 ff.

sima. Another instance is seen below in number 50, and a full list of examples is given by Olcott, *Thes. Ling. Epig.*, I, p. 314-5.

49. Small slab of white marble, 0,24 m. wide and 0,17 high, originally part of a double tablet from a columbarium. At the left is the hole for one of the nails by which it was attached to the wall, but on the right side, which is roughly broken, remain some traces of the conventional pattern which divided the tablet perpendicularly into two approximately equal parts. The inscription, which is cut in fairly good letters, is as follows:

CN · AEMILIO
FELICI
SVCCESSVS · L
B · D · S · M

At the end of the third line there is a trace of a lost letter, probably L, standing for *libertus*. The abbreviation in the last line for b(ene) d(e) s(e) m(erito) is common: cf. number 69 below.

50. Slab of white marble, 0,60 m. wide and 0,36 high, bearing the following inscription, carefully cut in small letters of a style closely resembling the *scriptura actuaria*:

	DOMVI AETERNAE CONSECRATAE ♂		
	AGILEIAE PRIMAE Q · È AVGVRIAE VXORI SVpra AETATEM CASTISSIMAE ET PVDICISSIMAE · ET FRVGALISSIMAE QVAE INNOCENTER MARITVM · ET DOMVM · EIVS AMAVIT OMNIA DE SE MERENTI FECIT Q · OPPIVS SECVNDVS MARITVS ET SIBI TEMPORE QVO SVM GENITA · NATVRA · MIHI · BIS DENOS TRIBVIT ANNOS QVIBVS COMPLETIS SEPTIMA DEINDE DIE · RESOLVTA LEGIBVS OTIO SVM PERPETVO · TRADITA HAEC MIHI · VITA · FVIT OPPI NE METVAS LETHEN · NAM STVLTVM · EST · TEMPORE · ET OM NI · DVNC · MORTEM · METVAS · AMITTERE GAVDIA · VITAE · MORS · ETENIM · HOMINVM · NATVRA · NON · POENA · EST · CVI · CONTIGIT · NASCI · INSTAT · ET · MORI · IGITVR · DOMINE OPPI MARITE NE DOLEAS MEI · QVOD PRAECESSI SVSTINEO IN AETERNO TORO ADVENTVM TVVM VALETE SVPERI · ET · CVNCTI · CVNCTAEQVE · VALETE ·		
♂	AVGVRIA ANIMA · DVLCS ET INNOCVA · HAVE		AVGVRIA INNOCVA ANIMA · TVA · IN BONO · ♂

This inscription was published in VI, 11252 on the basis of a copy made by Gatti, whose reading varies from the stone only in

the placing of a few points. The most striking feature here, as in number 81 below, is the metrical character of certain parts of the inscription, for example, of lines 10 and 11 where we find two complete hexameters:

Ne metuas Lethen nam stultum est tempore et omni
Du(m) mortem metuas amittere gaudia vitae.

In line 15 also we have a complete iambic senarius:

Sustineo in aeterno toro adventum tuum,

and in line 9 the latter half of a pentameter: *haec mihi vita fuit*. Similarly the last line, except at the beginning, is a good hexameter: $\angle \cup \cup \angle$ *superi et cuncti cunctaeque valet*, and slight changes produce the same result in line 12: *Mors etenim natura hominum, non poena (deorum) est*.¹ That most of these passages are due to literary reminiscence is very probable and the sources of some of them are pointed out in the brief notes which follow.

Line 2. *Auguria* is a nickname, as is shown by Q · E (= *quae et*): compare *Auguriorum* in VI, 10269. Its use as a cognomen and finally as a nomen naturally follows. See the examples in *Thes. Ling. Lat.* II, 1370, 47 ff.

Line 8. With *resoluta legibus* compare *Sil. It. xi, 36, resolutam legibus urbem*; though of course *legibus* has not the same force in the two passages.

Line 10. With the exception of the first words we have an almost exact quotation from the *Disticha Catonis* (II, 3, p. 223 B.) *Lingue metum leti; nam stultum est tempore in omni, dum mortem metuas, amittere gaudia vitae*. This seems to be the earliest *testimonium* to the *Disticha*, but as we cannot fix the date of the inscription, it avails little in determining the date of Cato.²

Line 12. Not only the thought but the expression of this and the following line is derived from Seneca, who repeatedly gives voice to similar sentiments. The writer of the inscription was probably thinking of a passage in the *De remediis fortuitorum* (II, 1 in Haase III, p. 447) which reads: *morieris, ista hominis natura est, non poena*, and in this reminiscence bears the earliest witness to a work which some scholars have refused to acknowledge as Seneca's. The case for Annaean authorship is some-

¹ This was suggested by Buecheler, *Carm. Epig.*, 1567, who grouped together a number of epitaphs of this character.

² Cf. C. Hosius, *Rhein. Mus.* 50, 1895, p. 300; Buecheler, *Carm. Epig.*, p. 858; Schanz, *Gesch. röm. Litt.*, § 519, p. 34.

what strengthened by the immediately following reflection of a passage in Seneca, Epist. 99, § 8, *omnis eadem condicio devinxit: cui nasci contigit, mori restat*. Other passages of Seneca which have a bearing are Dial. XII, 13, 2, *ultimum diem non quasi poenam, sed quasi naturae legem adspicis*; Nat. Quaest. VI, 32, 12, *mors naturae lex est*; Epigr. I, 7 (Poet. Lat. Min. IV, 1), *lex est, non poena perire*.

Line 14. *Ne doleas* is a common beginning for the hexameter in epitaphs, e. g., Buecheler, Carm. Epig., 775 and 1407.

Line 15. With *aeterno toro* compare XI, 1122, *et iuxta coniunx meritos testatur honores Aeternum retinens consociata torum*, and III, 2490, *aeterno iungit pia membra cubili*.

Line 16. *Valete superi*: cf. V, 4078, *valete ad superos*. For *superi* in the sense of *superstiles* see note on number 89 below.

The phrase *anima dulcis et innocua* of the left *ansa* has its parallel in a Christian inscription of the year 388 given by De Rossi, 370, *anima dulces innoca*. See also V, 170, *animae innocuae* and note on *anima dulcis* in number 48 above. With *in bono* of the right *ansa* compare a Christian inscription in Marucchi, n. 108, Attice, *spiritus tuus in bono*.

51. Small columbarium tablet, 0.18 m. wide and 0.10 high, with the usual holes at the ends and the nail on the right side still preserved. It is now in the possession of Dr. R. V. D. Magoffin, Johns Hopkins University. The inscription, cut in fairly good letters, is as follows:

L · ALBATIVS
PRIMIO

The *gens Albatia* is rarely attested and seems to belong to Etruria. In XI, 1355 two officials of the *collegium fabrum tignuariorum* at Luna are Q. Albatius Corinthus and Q. Albatius Verna, and Phlegon Trall. (III, 609 Müller) mentions 'Αλβαρία Σαβίνα πόλεως Πάρμης.

52. Travertine pigna from Palestrina, 0.25 m. in height, with the following inscription on the shoulder:

ALBINIVS

The name Albinus appears twice at Praeneste, namely XIV, 2968 and 2974. Here the absence of praenomen as well as the character of the cutting arouse suspicion of the genuineness of the inscription, which is rightly rejected by Dessau, Eph. Epig.,

IX, p. 450. Of the antiquity of the pigna itself there can be no doubt.

This inscription was published by Magoffin, *American Journal of Archaeology*, XIV, 1910, p. 51.

53. Front portion of a circular urn of white marble, which now measures 0,22 m. in width and 0,205 in height. On a sculptured *tabula ansata* (0,13 m. wide and 0,14 high) is cut in good letters the following inscription:

CN · ANNAEO
E V N O M O
C A L T I L I A
G E N I C E
COIVG · B · M *f.*

At the lower right hand corner a portion of the stone is broken away, carrying with it a part of the M and almost all of the F, which like the O in the first line ran over on the surrounding molding. As a rule, C and G are hardly to be distinguished on this stone: only in the initial of the fourth line is the form at all characteristic.

54. Tablet of pavonazzetto, 0,35 m. wide and 0,14 high, with the usual holes at the ends and with deeply cut lines in the form of a *tabula ansata*. The stone came from outside the porta Salaria and bears the following inscription, which is well cut, though in a somewhat vulgar style:

ANTISTIA · VRBANA
FECIT · AEDICVLAM · SIBI
ET · L · ANTISTIO · ILISSO
FILIO · SVO
IS VIXIT ANNIS XVIII

The use of *aedicula* with reference to the tomb or a part of it is very common at Rome though rarely found elsewhere. Thus the phrase *fecit aediculam* occurs again and again in the sixth volume of the *Corpus*, e. g. VI, 11685, 12677, 15547, 17652, 22584. The use of Ilissus as a cognomen or as a slave's name is not very common, but may be seen in IX, 484, Q. Atilio Q. l. Ilisso, and possibly also 4909 (see Mommsen's note). The

absence of the father's name as well as the coincidence of the nomina of mother and son points to illegitimacy.

55. Tablet of white marble, 0,445 m. wide and 0,18 high, bearing the following inscription:

CN · ANTONI · LAVMEDI sic
 AEMILIAI · O · L · HELICONIAI
 CN · ANTONI · CN · L sic
 MOSCHIONI

The letters are deeply cut and square, showing a certain lack of finish which recalls the work of late republican times, though I should not venture to assign it to so early a period. The fourth line and most of the third, as indicated by the inclined capitals, were cut *in rasura*, but no traces of earlier letters, if such existed, remain. LAVMEDI is the dative of Laumedes or Laomedes, which seems to be otherwise unattested either in Greek or in Latin. Compare, however, the equivalent form *Λεωμήδης* which occurs in I. G., II, 1010; XII, 293, 4; ib. 277, 142 (Thasos). Since therefore the dative is required, the graver should have cut ANTONIO in both instances. The dative in *-ai* is not unknown during the empire, e. g. VI, 921, Antoniai Augustai of the time of Claudius. Gnaeus as a praenomen in the *gens Antonia* is very rare, but occurs, e. g., in IX, 5428 (Falerio), Antonia Cn. fil. Picentina.

56. Tablet of marble, 0,305 m. wide and 0,22 high, with two holes for nails, one on the left at the top and the other on the right at the middle. The inscription, well cut in a style that can scarcely be later than the middle of the second century and still showing abundant traces of minium, runs as follows:

DIS · MANIBVS
 APPVLEIAE · GRATILLAE
 VIX · AN · XIII · M · VI · D · XV ·
 FECERVNT ·
 CN · COSSVTIVS · APRICLVS
 ET · APPVLEIA · LOCHIAS ·
 PATRONI · VERNAE · KARISSIMAE
 ET · L · APPVLEIVS · REGILLVS · TATA

All these proper names are already well attested. Of the cognomina Lochias is the most common and Apricius the least

frequent. It occurs, however, in VI, 1057, (7), 42, T. Anneius Apricu(s) and the feminine Apricla in VI, 16694 and 17794. TATA in the last line seems in this case, as often, to mean grandfather.¹

57. Small *tabula ansata*, 0,24 m. wide and 0,095 high, from a columbarium. The nails are still preserved in the holes at the ends. The marble, which was worked to a smooth surface only on the front, bears the following inscription:

ATTICA

TIB · CAESERIS · LEIB

sic

The letters are well formed and deeply cut and still show traces of minium. The date seems to be after 4 A. D., when Tiberius was adopted by Augustus, but before his accession in 14. The very natural error CAESERIS occurs also in IV, 2308, VI, 9492 and XIV, 2519. The use of the long form of I in EI (=i), though seen not rarely in republican inscriptions, is more common in the first century.²

58. Small slab of marble, 0,23 m. wide and 0,30 high, roughly chipped and broken on all sides, yet with slight injury to the inscription. The text, which is cut in fine square letters of a good period, runs as follows:

C · AVILIVS

MENOFH|LVs

FRONIME

FECIT · FILIA

DVLCISSIMa

QVAE · VIXIT

ANNIS · X|II

DIEBVS · XVII

Above FILIA in the third line FRONIME was added in small cramped letters, whether by the same or a later graver it is

¹ For a detailed discussion of the use of this and similar childish words, see W. Heraeus, *die Sprache der röm. Kinderstube*, in *Archiv f. lat. Lex.*, XIII, 148 ff., and especially 155. The examples in C. I. L. VI are given by Harrod, *Latin Terms of Endearment etc.*, pp. 53 and 57.

² J. Christiansen, *De apicibus et i longis inscriptionum latinarum*, p. 28 f.

impossible to determine. In *MENOFHILVS* too in the second line some later unskilled hand attempted to change the F to a P. Owing to the chipping away of the stone, letters have been lost at the ends of lines two, four, and five; possibly also of lines six and seven, though on this last point one may not speak with confidence. The *gens Avilia*, or *Avillia*, as it more commonly appears on the stones, is well attested both in Italy and in the provinces.¹ Strangely enough we find another Avillius Menophilus in VI, 34596, L. Avilli L. l. Menophili.

59. Fragment of marble whose extreme measurements are 0,175 m. wide (at the bottom) and 0,13 high (at the right side). The inscription, which is scratched rather than cut in a very vulgar style, is as follows:

REL
SSECV
NDVSA
VRELIA

To complete this we seem to need at the beginning of the first line a praenomen and AV and at the beginning of the second line IV, thus making it read [M(?) Au]rel | [iu]s Secu | nduss (?) A | urelia. The former S in the third line is written within the V and seems to be superfluous.

On the other side of this stone is scratched a picture of the crudest sort which displays about as much artistic skill as the graffiti of idlers usually show.² In the middle is represented something that looks like an erect tombstone coming to a point at the top. In the main field of this tombstone is a rough drawing of a human figure with large head and very slender body and legs. Above the head in the triangular space at the top is the word PIVS. Behind the tombstone—if such it is—stands a horse, hidden for the most part, but showing his head on the right and his haunches on the left of the stone. Above the horse's head is a circle and above that again a bird, and on the other side above the horse's haunches is an X with a character like a reversed N beneath it. To frame some ingenious theory

¹ Fulllest list of occurrences in Thes. Ling. Lat., II, 1451.

² Examples of such drawings may be seen in Not. d. Scav., 1904, p. 155, 1907, p. 546, and in Wuensch, Sethianische Verfluchungstafeln aus Rom, pp. 8 ff.

in explanation of all this would not be difficult, but it seems wiser as well as nearer the truth to say that its significance is not apparent.

60. Lower part of the front of a marble cinerary urn, 0,39 m. wide and 0,115 high. Between the bases of the fluted pilasters which marked the corners is the space set apart for the name of the dead. The inscription, which is well cut, though not in the finest monumental style, is as follows:

FLORA · BAEBIA · > · L

The *gens Baebia* is one of the old plebeian families of Rome and gave to the Republic men of high rank in both peace and war. Flora is very common as the name of slaves and freedwomen and of course the particular Baebia who was her *patrona*, cannot be identified. Other recently discovered members of the *gens* are reported in Not. d. Scav., 1899, p. 79; 1903, p. 351; 1905, p. 300 and L'Ann. Epig., 1903, nn. 189, 234, 363.

61. Small marble tablet, 0,21 m. wide and 0,125 high, still preserving the nails by which it was attached to the wall of the tomb. The inscription, which is well cut and of a good period, is as follows:

C · CALPURNIVS
C · L
SABINVS

The names are too common to call for remark. Even a Calpurnius Sabinus occurs in VI, 14196 and a Calpurnia Sabina in VI, 14249.

62. Pigna of travertine from Palestrina, 0,38 m. in height, ornamented with a conventional leaf pattern on the throat. The inscription, which is well cut in letters probably of the second century B. C., consists of the single word

CAMELIA

This family is well attested at Praeneste in XIV, 3080-3084. The Camelia of 3083 doubtless belongs to an earlier generation on account of the form of L with the acute angle at the base.¹

¹ This inscription was first published by Magoffin, l. c., p. 52, n. 4. Dessau, Ephem. Epig. IX. p. 450 is clearly mistaken in identifying it with XIV, 3083.

63. Marble cinerary urn in the form of a temple, measuring 0,26 m. wide, 0,21 deep and 0,265 high to the peak. The roof is carved to represent a covering of leaf-shaped tiles and has an antefix at each corner. In the pediment are sacrificial emblems in relief, the patera in the centre, the pitcher at the left, and the sprinkler at the right. Between the pilasters which stand at the corners is the usual space for the inscription, which is carefully cut in a good style and reads as follows:

DI|S · MANIBVS
CLAUDIO
ALEXANDRO

Here again the names are very common. In VI, 4469 we have C. Claudius Alexander, ib. 14912-3 Ti. Claudius Alexander and ib. 34856 Claudius Alexander. On the form DI|S, which occurs also in number 71 below and in VI, 19878, see Christiansen, l. c., p. 33.

64. Sepulchral altar of white marble, now broken into two pieces, 0,255 m. wide, 0,16 deep, and 0,66 high, with the usual volutes at the top and the *urceus* and *patera* on the sides. In the top are five holes, one at each corner and one in the centre, for the metal clamps by which some object was attached. The inscription, surrounded by the usual moldings, is well cut in the monumental style and reads as follows:

	D · M	
	TI · CLAUDIO	
	PROCLO · FE	
	CIT · FLAVIA	
<i>urceus</i>	<u>PRIMITIVA</u>	<i>patera</i>
	COIVGI · SVO	
	BENEMERENTI	
	HOMINI BONO	

This inscription was first copied in the latter part of the fifteenth century by Lucundus, and appears in C. I. L., VI, 15231. Here the editors, following Rambertus, have called the stone *urna* instead of *ara* and have accepted the text as given by Armellini,

Cronichetta, 1878, p. 192, who reports the location "in vinea via Salaria nova ad dextram paullo ultra coemeterium Priscillae". The only variant from his reading concerns the separative point in the last line, which does not appear on the stone. The synco-pated form Proclus for Proculus is by no means rare: similarly Procla for Procula. The phrase *homo bonus* appears in a Christian inscription of Mauretania (Dessau, 7762) and also occurs six times in the sixth volume. See Harrod, l. c., p. 35.

65. Tablet of white marble, 0,37 m. wide and 0,20 high, with the following inscription:

D · M · CLAVDIAE · EVTΥCHIAE
VALERIA · OLYMPIAS · MATRI
PISSIMAE · ET · L · VALERIVS · TERPNVS
COIVGI · CARISSIMAE · ET · C · PLAETO
RIVS · AMABILIS · FECERVNT
ET · SIBI · ET · SVIS · POSTERISQVE
· E O R V M ·

The letters are fairly well cut, but are probably not earlier than the end of the second century. The form of G in the fourth line and the regularly closed loop of P among other indications are suggestive of the later period. The names are all well known; even the combination Claudia Eutychia occurs in VI, 15411-18 and 34922. On the ways of writing *piissimus* in the inscriptions with reference to the *I longa*, see Christiansen, l. c., p. 34.

66. Cinerary urn of marble, 0,585 m. wide, 0,355 deep, and 0,22 high, from outside the porta Salaria. This urn is plainly but tastefully made, lacking almost entirely the ornamental carving with which many urns are overloaded. There are two compartments each with its own cover, and on the front, surrounded by the usual moldings, is the following inscription, carefully cut in good letters of early imperial times:

COELIAE · Q · L · ATHENAIDI
Q · COELIVS · PRIMVS
PATRONVS

From the same quarter comes the inscription VI, 34984, Coelia Aphrodisia and in the columbaria are 6892, Q. Coelius Q. l.

Bacchius, and 7899, Q. Coelius Hermes. But the name is common and no connection is suggested as more than possible. Probably the most prominent Q. Coelius is the praetor of VI, 91 who made a dedication to Concordia in the reign of Tiberius.

67. Small tablet of grey marble, 0,195 m. wide and 0,095 high, from outside the porta Salaria. It is now broken into two almost equal parts and bears the following inscription in letters of a careless and vulgar style:

COSCONIA · CALITYCHE
VIXSIT · ANNOS · XVIII
LETO · DATA · EST · PR · IDVS · IVL
IDIBVS · ELATA · EST
IVLLO · ANTONIO · AFRICANO · COS

This stone owes its chief interest and importance to the fact that it bears the names of the consuls of 10 B. C. and thus has a definite date. Iullus Antonius was the son of the triumvir and was addressed by Horace in *Carm.* IV, 2. The spelling of his name, which appears wrongly as Iulius or Iulus in many manuscript sources not only of Horace but of other authors, was finally established by an inscription discovered on the Esquiline in the spring of 1888 (VI, 30974). This inscription is a dedication to Mercury by Augustus in 10 B. C. and gives the names of the consuls as Iullo Antonio Africano Fabio cos. Further testimony comes from VI, 12010, M. Antoni Iulli | patris l. Rufionis and now again from our inscription.¹ The mention of Africanus Fabius Maximus by his first name only is due to lack of space, as well as to the fact that Africanus was well known as a cognomen. This is also the reason why the *Chronographus* of the year 354, the *Fasti Hydatiani*, and the *Chronicon Paschale* all report Africanus and Maximus as the consuls of the year 744 A. U. C.²

¹ This question has been sufficiently discussed by Huelsen, *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1888, 667; Mommsen, *Hermes*, 1888, 155 ff. = *Phil. Schriften*, 187 f.; Buecheler, *Rhein. Mus.*, 1889, 317; Gatti, *Bull. Com.*, 1888, 235 f. and tav. XII; *Pros. Imp. Rom.*, svv.

² See *Bull. Com.*, 1888, 236 f.

Probably no name shows more varied orthography than the cognomen of our Cosconia. The form Callityche is of course the most common, but Calityche is found also in VI, 26265, 28333 and Bull. Com., 1907, p. 197; Calithyce in VI, 11018, 27615, 33649; Caletyce in Not. d. Scav., 1909, p. 461 and Bull. Com., 1906, p. 315; Calytice in Bull. Com., 1906, p. 99; Callituche in VI, 4510, 6185, 18302; Callityce in VI, 10676; Callytyche in VI, 16537. Burial on the next day after death was unusual in ancient as in modern times, but examples are recorded in the humbler walks of life and especially in Christian inscriptions. In this case the season may have had its influence. Other instances are Marucchi, *Epigrafia Crist.*, n. 328, *recessit die Mercuris ora viii et deposita die Iovis Iduum Maiarum*; *ib.* n. 341, *defunctus est diae (?) Saturni et sepultus diae (?) Solis vi Kal. April.*; Not. d. Scav., 1908, p. 465, *recessit viii Id. Aug. deposita est in pace vii Idus Augustas*; Bull. Com., 1905, p. 310 [*in pa]ce v Idus D[ecembris]* *dep. iiiii*. The use of XS for X at this period and the old formulaic expression *leto datus* quoted by Varro, *L. L.* vii, 42 and Festus, p. 336, 34 (*de Ponor*) are too well known to require further comment.

68. Tablet of white marble, 0,18 m. wide and 0,18 high, with the following inscription carefully cut in a good style:

D A D V C V S
 LAMILLAE · SER
 VIXIT · ANN · XX
 CARVSVI[S]
 MA SOROR · FEC

The most interesting of these names is Lamilla, which I do not recall having met with elsewhere. It is, however, a diminutive from *Lamia* and similar in formation to *Plotilla*, *Domitilla* and *Albucilla*.¹ *Daduchus* as a name of slave or freedman is found, for example, in VI, 12651, 16716 and Not. d. Scav., 1902, p. 133, and *Ma* occurs in VI, 12471, *Oppia Sp. f. Ma*, *ib.*, 2356, *Orbia Ma*, and XIV, 3157, *Ma*. On the common form *SVI[S]*, see Christiansen, *l. c.*, p. 33.

¹ Paucker has discussed personal names in *-illa* in Kuhn's *Zeitschrift*, xxiii, pp. 184-8.

69. Marble tablet, 0,225 m. wide and 0,19 high, with the following inscription, which is deeply cut but in a somewhat vulgar style:

D · M ·
 CN · DOMITI D LIB
 HYMNI · V · A · IV · M ·
 V · D · XXIII · FECIT · HE
 RACLIA MATER · FIL ·
sic PIINTISSIMO · D S · B ·
 M

Hymnus and Heraclia or Heraclea are well known as names of slaves or freedmen and need no comment. The abbreviations D S · B · M signify d(e) s(e) b(ene) m(erito): cf. no. 49 above.

70. Pigna of travertine from Palestrina, 0,33 m. in height, with the following inscription on the base:

C · F A B I V S

Dessau regards this with suspicion and relegates it to a footnote in Ephem. Epig., IX, p. 450; on the whole his suspicion seems well grounded. The cutting of F in particular, with short middle stroke, looks like the work of a modern graver.

71. Tablet of marble, 0,265 m. wide and 0,135 high, with a conventional waving pattern at the top, a tree on each side and a wreath and two snakes at the bottom. The inscription, carefully cut in good letters, is as follows:

D I | S · M A N I B V S
arbor F A B I A E · T E R T V L L A E *arbor*
 V I X I T · A N N I S · X X V
anguis *anguis*
corona

For the form D I | S, see the note on number 63 above.

72. Marble slab of triangular shape like the pediment of a building, measuring 0,44 m. wide at the bottom and 0,195 high,

and lacking a small fragment on the right side.⁷³ The inscription, which is cut in a good style of the early part of the second century, reads as follows:

D X M
 FELICI · CAES ·
 N · SER · VERN · Q · V · AN ·
 XIII · MENS · X · DIEB · VII ·
 FEC · M · VLP · AVG · LIB · PACATVS
 ET · CAELIA · VENVSINA · PARENT · F · B · M ·
 SIBI · SVISQ · POSTERISQ · SVORVM ·

D(is) M(anibus). Felici, Caes(aris) n(ostri) ser(vo) vern(ae), q(ui) v(ixit) an(nis quattuordecim), mens(ibus decem), dieb(us septem), fec(erunt) M(arcus) Ulpus, Aug(usti) lib(ertus), Pacatus et Caelia Venusina parent(es) f(ilio) b(ene) m(erenti) e[t] sibi suisq(ue) posterisq(ue) suorum.

The imperial master of Felix was doubtless Trajan, the *patronus* of M. Ulpus Pacatus. The use of Venusina as a personal name is not common, but may be seen, for example, in IX, 771. For the comparatively rare use of the *ascia* on inscriptions from Rome, see note on number 24 above in the fourth article, p. 28.

73. Marble *tabula ansata*, 0,36 m. wide and 0,155 high, with the following inscription in fairly good letters:

L · FIRMIO · VITALI
 CLAVDIA · METHE
 ET · SIBI · FECIT

None of these names is rare. The most interesting is Methe (μῆθη) which is well attested as a slave name in both Greek and Latin and recalls such suggestive names as Phiale and Dipsas,¹ though these of course do not belong to the class of abstract nouns used as personal names.

74. Block of marble 0,44 m. wide, 0,16 high, and 0,12 thick with fluting on the back which shows that it was once part of a

¹ Phiale in Iuv. 10, 238; Dipsas . . . ex re nomen habet, Ovid, Am., 1, 8, 2 f.

pilaster. On the front in good letters of the first or early part of the second century is the following inscription:

SOLO · DONATO · A T · FLAV
NICEROS · L I B · S I B I ·
L I B E R T A B V S Q V E

It is evident that these lines are incomplete and that about half of the inscription is missing at the right. Under these circumstances it is of course impossible to identify this T. Flavius among the many of that name, although the generous gifts of T. Flavius Syntrophus to his freedmen, as attested in VI, 10239, at once come to mind. The more common expression to indicate a gift of ground for a tomb or monument is *locus datus* or *locus donatus*, e. g. XIV, 197 and 995.

75. Slab of marble, 0,13 m. wide and 0,515 high, in the conventional tombstone shape with rounded top and projecting points at the upper corners. It is broken horizontally into two pieces somewhat above the middle. The upper portion, which measures 0,13 m. wide by 0,20 high, bears the following inscription, fairly well cut in a style that probably does not much antedate the year 200 A. D.:

'D · M'
T · F L A V I
E V T Y C H E
'FLAVIA'
C A L L I T Y C H E
C O N I V G I · B E N E
'M E R E N T I
'F E C I T'

The genitive *Eutyche* for *Eutychoe* occurs also in VI, 18059, T. Flavi Sp. f. Eutyche. The nominative appears in VIII, 5236, M. Antonius Eutycho and XIII, 6423, Eutychoas disp(ensator) and the dative in XIV, 2408, L. Acilio L. f. Pompt. Eutyche.¹

¹ Dessau supplies a final syllable, thus: Eutyche[ti]; but this seems quite unnecessary.

Other forms of the name of course are common, e. g., VI, 18058, T. Flavio Eutyheti and Not. d. Scav., 1905, p. 118, T. Flavius Eutyclus. For the spelling of Callityche see above on number 67.

76. Slab of marble, 0,295 m. wide and 0,34 high, rounded at the top, with the following inscription cut in a good style of the latter part of the first century :

D · M ·
T · F L A V I O · T · F
Q V I R I N A · R Y
T H I M I A N O · F E
C I T · R Y T H Y M V S
P A T E R · A V G · L ·
V I X I T · A N N I S ·
D V O B V S · M E N S I
B V S · O C T O · D I E
B V S · D E C E M

In the fourth line a later hand attempted to change the first I to Y.


The name Rythymus, so far as my observation goes, is unattested. It seems to be derived from the Greek *ῥυθμός* with the insertion of Y which may be due to some obscure analogy. If we might assume that Rythymus is merely a graver's error for Euthymus, a possibility suggested to me in correspondence by Dr. Dessau, all difficulty would disappear. The reading on the stone, however, is perfectly clear and admits of no doubt as to what was actually written. The son of the imperial freedman was given his father's cognomen in the secondary form Rythimianus just as in IX, 1506 the *third* son of M. Cosinius Priscus was called M. Cosinius Priscianus.¹ It is worthy of remark also that he is assigned to the *tribus Quirina*, the tribe of the Flavian imperial family which originally came from the neighborhood of Reate.²

77. Slab of white marble, 0,52 m. wide and 0,45 high, with conventional molding at top and bottom, but roughly broken at the sides. It may have been the middle portion of the front of a sarcophagus, and bears the following inscription in well cut

¹ Marquardt-Mau, *Privatleben*, p. 24, n. 5.

² Suet., *Vesp.*, I.

letters of a period not earlier than the latter part of the second century :

D	·	M	
FL ·	PRIMITIVA ·	FEC	[it
SIBI ·	ET ·	RESTITVTO ·	CONI[u
GI ·	CARISIMO	SVO ·	ET <i>sic</i>
LIBERTIS ·	LIBER	QVAE POS	<i>sic</i>
TERISQVE ·	AEORVM		<i>sic</i>
H ·	M ·		H · B · N · S ·

The spelling CARISIMO has its parallels in VI, 20094, 21273, 29324 and elsewhere, and the substitution of AE for short open E as in LIBER(*tabus*) QVAE and AEORVM is common. The significance of B in the last line is unknown to me, unless it be merely a graver's error for E in the usual formula h(oc) m(onumentum) h(eredem) e(xterum) n(on) s(equetur). This stone, like number 72 above, adds one more to the comparatively small number of instances of the *ascia* found at Rome. See note on number 24 above in the fourth article, p. 28.

78. Tablet of marble from a columbarium, 0,43 m. wide and 0,13 high, with the usual nail hole at each end. The inscription, which is cut in good letters of a comparatively early period of the empire, reads as follows:

OLL · II

FLÁVIA · D · L · SALVIA ·
 PATRONO · DAT · OLLA · T · D · S · P
 D · FLÁVIVS · D · L · BARNAEVS

These cognomina are not very common but *Salvia* is, for example, the cognomen of a freedwoman in VI, 25842 and *Ephem.* Epig. VIII, p. 135, n. 529 and *Salvius* of a freedman *ib.*, p. 129, n. 503. *Barnaesus*, too, occurs in V, 8905 and in *Cicero*, Att. xiv, 19, 1. For the usual *ollam dat* we find *dat olla(m)* not rarely used, as in VI, 3994, *Gemina l. Augustae | ornatrix | Irene l. suae dat olla*. Similarly *ib.* 3936, 4094, 4265. *Dat ollam* on the other hand appears *ib.* 3967, 4012, 4107, and *dat oll(am)*, *ib.*

4065, 4102, 4236. The initial letters in the second line probably signify t(itulum) d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia).

79. Thin tablet of marble, 0,205 m. wide and 0,105 high, with the following inscription carefully cut between guiding lines scratched on the surface :

GARGONIA · C · L

ANOTALE

sic

H · S · E

On the other side of the tablet, cut less carefully but apparently by the same hand, stands the same inscription with the misspelling corrected and the separative points in the last line omitted :

GARGONIA · C · L ·

ANATOLE

F S E

The immediate discovery of his error seems to have led the graver to reverse the stone and repeat the inscription. The names are rather uncommon, though well attested in the inscriptions. For example, we find Gargonia Valentina in VI, 18886, Aelia Anatole ib. 11607 and Licinia O. l. Anatole in Not. d. Scav., 1900, p. 579.

80. Tablet of marble, 0,32 m. wide and 0,20 high, inscribed with good letters of the early imperial period. An incised conventional pattern surrounds the text, which reads as follows :

D | S · M A N I B V S

L · G E L L I · F E L I C I S

V A L E R I A · O N O M A S E

V I R O · S V O E T · S I B I

P O S T E R I S Q · S V I S · F E C I T

The third line was erased in antiquity but not so completely as to make decipherment impossible. Another L. Gellius Felix appears in VI, 18964 and Onomaste as a cognomen of freedwomen is fairly common, e. g., XIV, 1233, 3774 and 3832, Rubellia L. l. Onomaste.

81. Slab of white marble from outside the Porta Salaria, 0,25 m. wide and 0,345 high, broken into two parts by a violent blow, doubtless of a workman's pickaxe. The stone is roughly broken also at the bottom. The inscription, which is cut in small but well made letters, reads as follows :

P . GRATTIVS . SP . F
COL . CELER
H|C · EGO NVNC · IACEO · GRATTIVS
INFELIX · SVB · TEGMINE · TERRAE
5 BARBA · DEPOSITA · PERAGENS
TERTIVM · ET · V|CENSIMVM · ANNVM
INFELIX · INDIGNE · SVBIECTVS
ACERBE · MORTE · NEFANDA
OCCL|SVS · CALCE · ET · MANIBVS · EXTRA
10 FATVM · PROTRVSVS · IN HAS · TENEBRAS
HOC · OPTO · MORIARE · MAL|S · EX
EMPL|S · CRVCIATVS · ET · IPSE
NEC · TE NVNC · LICEAT · QVO · ME
PR|VAST| · LVMEN · VIDERE
15 ET · TV · DES · POENAS · QVAS · MERVISTI
DEFENSVS · IN|QVE
VOS · NVNC · CONSO

This text was first published in Not. d. Scav., 1900, p. 578, by Gatti, whose copy varies from the stone only in its omission of four separative points and in its failure to record seven of the eight examples of the *I longa*. These errors, however, were for the most part corrected in Bull. Com., 1901, p. 103. Two other inscriptions from the same region seem to show that a *collegium funeraticium* was organized in the *familia* of P. Grattius: Bull. Com., 1902, p. 88, n. 4, P. Gratt[ius] P. l. Heracl[a], | mag(ister) de[sign(atus)] and ib. 1901, p. 103, P. Gr[attius P. l.] | Dio . . . [omnibus] | honoribu[s f]unct(us) | in familia. Our P. Grattius Celer, like illegitimate sons generally, is assigned to the *tribus Collina*, the least honorable of the four city tribes.

The most interesting feature of this inscription is the fact that it is made up almost entirely of the *disiecta membra* of poetry, stray snatches of verse, most of which are mere commonplaces of the epitaph, while others recall with more or less force passages

from classical authors. Slight changes and occasional omissions would transform this chaos into hexameters which are at least as good as the average verses found in the *Carmina Epigraphica*:

Hic ego nunc iaceo infelix sub tegmine terrae,
Barba deposita, peragens vicensimum | annum,
Indigne subiectus, acerbæ morte nefanda
Occisus, calce et manibus protrusus in — .
Hoc opto moriari malis cruciatus et ipse
Exemplis.
Nec te nunc liceat quo me — — videre.
Et tu des poenas quas — defensu inique.
Vos nunc conso[lor].

To the popular mind even rhythmical phrases and unfinished or imperfect verses made their irresistible appeal and it is by no means unusual to find in the epitaphs the metrical form of a line as a whole utterly shattered by the introduction of a name or the change of a number. For example, VIII, 10828 has in iambic senarius quæ dum per annos bis XVIII vita gerit, where *decem* was changed to XVIII to suit a new occasion. Similarly in a pentameter X, 5020 we read In sexto et decem ascendens deposui hanc animam, where *et decem* is superfluous. The strange state of mind indicated by these phenomena has its parallel in modern times also as the following clipping from the memorial column of a recent newspaper shows:

God alone knows how we miss thee
In our home, O daughter and sister dear,
How for thee our hearts are yearning,
How we long thy praise to hear.
By her Mother and Sisters.

To throw light on the method of such compositions a few comments and parallels are added. Their number could be greatly increased by a careful reading of Buecheler's *Carmina Epigraphica* or even by a perusal of the pages of Lier and Tolman.¹

Line 3. *Hic ego nunc iaceo*: B(uecheler) 373, 3, hic ego nunc iac(eo); ib. 389, 3, hic ego secure iaceo; 399, Florus ego hic iaceo; ib. 496, hic iaceo infelix; cf. Ovid, *Trist.* iii, 1, 73, hic ego qui iaceo.

¹B. Lier, *Topica carminum sepulcralium Latinorum*, in *Philologus*, 1903, pp. 445 and 563; ib. 1904, p. 54. J. A. Tolman, *A Study of the Sepulchral Inscriptions in Buecheler's Carmina Epigraphica Latina*. Chicago, 1910.

Line 4. *sub tegmine terrae*: Verg. Ecl. 1, 1, sub tegmine fagi; cf. B. 400, 6, at quamvis te terra tegat, and n. 48 above (at end).

Line 5-6. *Peragens... annum*: B. 588, 3, ter senis misero et quattuor paene peractis annis.

Line 7. *Indigne*: B. 1007, 2, indigne raptus; ib. 619, hostibus indigne saeva n[unc morte peremptus] dunc cupit infelix flammam [inferre].

Line 9. *Calce et manibus*: Plaut. Poen. 819, incursat pugnis, calcibus; Cic. Verr. iii, 56, cum pugnis et calcibus concisus esset.

Line 10. *Protrusus in has tenebras*: Phaed. V, 7, 39, capite est protrusus foras; Stat. Theb. ii, 25, has... tenebras (in the same sense).

Line 11-12. *Hoc opto*: compare VI, 36467, opto ei, ut cum | dolore corporis | longo tempore vivat | et cum mortuus fue[rit] inferi eum non | recipiant. The awful nature of the curse reminds one of the *defixiones*. The same construction is seen in B. 1191, 9, optamus dulce quiesc[ant]. Parallels for the colloquial *malis exemplis cruciatus* abound in Plautus and elsewhere.

Line 14. *Privasti (lumine)*: Macrob. III, 9, 10, lumine supero privetis; B. 445, 5, hanc annus x privavit munere lucis; ib. 651, pribatus luci; ib. 516, 7, luce privata; ib. 398, 2, caruit luce; ib. 514, 2, fraudatus luce. For other similar expressions, see Tolman, l. c., p. 41. With *lumen videre* compare B. 392, cernere lucem; ib. 474, 8, luce(m) videre.

Line 16. *Defensus inique*: Iuv. x, 85, male defensus.

The rest of the sepulchral inscriptions will form the basis of the next paper.

HARRY LANGFORD WILSON.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

III.—HIATUS IN THE ACCENTUAL CLAUSULAE OF BYZANTINE GREEK PROSE.

The treatment of hiatus in the rhythmical prose of Byzantine Greek writers is a matter which can be thoroughly tested by the law of the rhythm known as Meyer's Law. Such a test yields a result which is surprising in itself, and at the same time throws an interesting light on the manner in which the literary language of Athens was treated by men of letters after the third century of our era.

The attitude of the writers of classical times in this matter, both poets and prose writers, is well understood; hiatus was a thing to be avoided, and was tolerated only within certain narrow limits. The most careful writers of prose held to as rigid a rule as that which obtained in poetry, and a small number of cases of hiatus is always testimony to the *limae labor*. It was only natural, therefore, that those who, in later centuries, strove to follow in the footsteps of the best writers of classical times, should have carefully observed this well-established rule. In Byzantine times the tradition was one well-known to all, especially those who sought to reproduce the form and spirit of the old Attic. And indeed no more than a cursory perusal of such writers is required to convince one that the masterpieces of the fifth and fourth centuries before Christ were the models in this respect, as in many others.

But here we are concerned with a very definite question, which is not settled by the admission of the general proposition that hiatus was avoided on principle by careful writers of Byzantine times. The question is now limited to clausulae, and so has to do only with a few words in each clause—those words, namely, on which the writer expended particular care in order to obtain a definite closing cadence. Further it is proposed to discover not only how often hiatus occurs in this position, but also what kinds of hiatus are allowed.

The rhythmical prose with which we have to deal offers a situation which is, in general, extremely simple. We have a

rule that either two or four syllables without stress may intervene between the last two spoken accents of every colon and comma; other combinations are excluded. Manifestly a clausula of such simple structure, measured by a mechanical count of the syllables, will generally show at a glance whether the rhythmic structure allows hiatus to stand, or requires that it be avoided by elision, aphaeresis or crasis.

Since the question which has been raised cannot be settled by an appeal to the usage of any single writer, it has been found necessary to gather evidence from writing of as many different kinds as possible, and from writers of different interests and different training, in order to make general conclusions safe. With this in view eight writers of the fourth and fifth centuries A. D. have been examined, and an attempt made to gather together all cases which can have any possible bearing on the question. All clausulae, both at slight sense pauses and at the ends of periods, have been included. This method has introduced a possibility of error, since it is often well nigh impossible to discover just where the minor sense pauses in a sentence occur, but fortunately the rhythmic structure gives much assistance in locating the clausulae. It has been thought safest to begin with writers whose clausulae show approximate regularity throughout, and thereafter to see what can be done with the writing of others, who did not reach such mechanical perfection of style. In order not to weary the reader with a long array of examples, only those cases will be taken into account at all where the evidence is perfectly clear; within each group examples will suffice to illustrate what is included in the different subdivisions.

Remark 1. The method of counting clausulae before all sense pauses brings into the count many clausulae which are not generally marked by punctuation; clausulae have been sought at the end of participial phrases and at the end of clauses followed by a coordinate clause introduced by *καί*. This principle has been followed in all the writers presented in the following discussion.

Remark 2. It must be remembered that in all cases the figures giving totals of regular and irregular Forms are based on a reading of the text exactly as it stands in the edition used in each case; many an irregularity would disappear if the manuscripts of the rhythmical prose writers should be reconsidered in

the light of the rhythmical law. This may be said to apply in particular to the works of the Church Fathers, whose writings have, in most cases, found no editor since the time of the "Patrologia Graeca". On the other hand the clausulae presented below are *not* printed in every case as they stand in the editions used; elisions, etc., are indicated or omitted without regard to the manuscript tradition, which can have no bearing on the matter; the clausulae are so printed as to be read as regular Forms as they stand.

I. PROCOPIUS OF GAZA.

The works of Procopius comprise a collection of Epistles written in a careful literary style.¹ In Epistles I-CI (omitting XLIX, which is addressed to Procopius), the accentual rhythm is found to be used with considerable regularity. Counting the clausulae at all sense pauses, only 11 per cent. of the total number (2088) are found which do not conform to the regular Forms which are designated as Form 2 (˘ ~ ~ ˘ [~ ~]) and Form 4 (˘ ~ ~ ~ ~ ˘ [~ ~]).

Group I. Cases involving a possible elision, 47.

Elision demanded, ² 23.		Elision impossible, 12.	
τε	0	1	λέγειν εἰτε ὀνόματα, ⁴ XCII.
δέ	2 e. g. νῦν δ' ἰσως φίλοι. ³ LXX.	6 e. g. ἤκουε δὲ οὐδέν. LXXX.	
Prep.	20 e. g. βούλομαι δι' ὑμῶν. LXXXII.	1	ταῦτα παρὰ ὑμῖν, XCII.
Others	1 δομ' αὐτῷ, LXXVIII.	4 e. g. ἐμνηχανήσαντο ἄνθρωποι, LIII.	
Doubtful, 12.			

Result: clear cases of genuine hiatus, 12. Evidence *for* elision, 23-12; (but of the 23 cases note that 20 involve prepositions).

¹ Ed. Hercher: Epistolographi Graeci.

² Sc. by the rhythm.

³ The marks of punctuation, if any, found in the text used will be kept in each case; in cases where these are lacking, it will be understood that the pauses were not regarded by the editor of the text as distinct enough to justify any punctuation.

⁴ This case presents a situation which comes up repeatedly. The clausula may be read as Form 2 or Form 4, according as the stress on *εἰτε* is regarded as sufficient to stand out as the opening stress of the clausula or not. For our present inquiry this question makes no difference, for in either case the necessity of elision is not affected.

Group II. Cases involving *ν* movable,¹ 58.

	Elision demanded, 5.	Mov. cons. must be retained, 49.
ε ι	ἦχ' ὁ Στρατήγιος, XC.	24 c. g. ἐπῆλθεν ἐκεῖνος. LXVI.
ι 4 c. g.	κατὰ νοῦν ἐστ' ἀνθρώποις, CI.	25 c. g. ὑποπεύουσιν ἀνθρώποι· XC.
	Doubtful, 4.	

Result: 49-5 in favor of *ν* movable as against elision.

Group III. Cases involving a possible crasis,² 35.

	Crisis demanded, 6.	Crisis impossible, 26.
Article 3 c. g.	ἐμιμήσατο τοῦνομα, LXXXII.	14 c. g. ἐτους αἱ ὥραι, LXXX.
καὶ 3 c. g.	πάντως γὰρ, LXXXIV.	12 c. g. ἐστηκός καὶ ἀκίνητος, LXXV.

To these should be added two cases involving the second personal reflexive:

οἶμαι σαυτῷ, LXIII.
παρέχεις σαυτόν, LXXXVI.

One case involving the third personal reflexive seems to give its testimony in favor of crasis: λογισμὸν ἐφ' αὐτόν, XV. Here the only escape from reading with crasis is λογισμὸν ἐπὶ ἐαυτόν, but it has been seen above that the elision of the final vowels of prepositions is far more common than the opposite procedure, and the probability is decidedly in favor of the former reading with crasis.

One more case must be added: οὐκ ἀνέξομαι μὴ οὐ λαμπρὸς εἶναι LXXXV. The clausula is probably μὴ οὐ λαμπρὸς εἶναι (ζ | ~ | ~ ζ | ~ ~), but there is a possibility of ἀνέξομαι μὴ οὐ λαμπρὸς εἶναι (ζ ~ ~ | ~ | ~ ζ | ~ ~), with synizesis.

Result: clear cases of genuine hiatus, 26. Evidence against crasis, 28-7.

Group IV. Cases involving a possible aphaeresis, 1.

Crisis impossible: ἐμαντοῦ ἐπιλέλθωμαι. XCV.

Group V. Cases of hiatus not avoidable by elision, etc., 3.

ἀρχονσι πρὸ ὑμῶν, LXXXII.
ἐμαντοῦ ἡνιάθην, LXXXVII.
πάντως περὶ ἡμῶν, LXXII.

Summary: in all groups together 42 clear cases of genuine

¹ Such cases are taken into account in connection with the question of elision, because there was always the possibility of eliding the short vowel instead of covering it by the movable consonant.

² It has been assumed for purposes of definiteness that an initial vowel or diphthong can suffer crasis with any form of the article not ending in a consonant, or with *καί*. When other possible cases are observed, they will be noted separately.

hiatus are found, 2.01 + % of the total number of clausulae read, 2088.

II. CHORICIUS OF GAZA.

In the case of Choricus, one of the pupils of Procopius of Gaza, the text of some of his writings may be read in a modern critical edition.¹ The question of hiatus in this writer has been treated exhaustively by C. Kirsten (*Quaestiones Choricianae*, Bres. Phil. Abh. VII (1895), pp. 25-35), but his treatment is mechanical and the evidence of the rhythm is not brought to bear. His labor seems to have been confined to gathering all cases of written hiatus; for example *μάλιστα εἶναι* (p. 27) is given as a bona fide example of hiatus, without mention of the possibility of elision. For this reason and because the present article has to do only with hiatus in clausulae his results have no bearing on this discussion. From the four orations read² it is clear that Choricus was an extremely careful stylist. The regularity of the rhythm is surprising: among the total of 1563 clausulae counted only 74 (4.7 + %) do not conform to the two regular Forms.

Group I. Cases involving a possible elision, 14.

Elision demanded, 1.		Elision impossible, 12.	
τε	ο	1	αὶ φῆμαί τε ῥέουσιν Epi. Zach. 12.
δέ	ο	2	e. g. ἀδυνάτως δὲ ἔχων Lyd. 38.
Others 1 ἐγὼ δὲ σ' ἡξίουν Lyd. 5.		9	e. g. ταῦτα ἀκούσας Mil. 52.
Doubtful, 1.			

Result: clear cases of genuine hiatus, 12. Evidence against elision, 12-1.

Note. It is to be observed that only two of these 13 clausulae stand before distinct sense pauses: *ἀνεδήσατο ἄθλον*, Epi. Zach. 7 and *φιλόγητα εἶναι*, Epi. Zach. 7. In neither of these two cases is elision possible.

Group II. Cases involving ν movable, 35.

Elision demanded, 1.		Mov. cons. must be retained, 30.	
ε	ο	17	e. g. ἐμήνυσεν ἡκειν, Lyd. 1.
1	1 περιττός ἐσθ' ὁ λόγος Epi. Zach. 11.	13	e. g. φέρουσιν ἀκοαί, Epi. Proc. 38.
Doubtful, 4.			

Result: 30-1 in favor of ν movable as against elision.

¹ Ed. Richard Foerster: *Index lectionum in universitate litterarum Vratislaviensi* 1891, 1892, 1893.

² Epithalamium to Zacharias; Epithalamium to Procopius, Johannes and Elias; The Lydians; Miltiades.

Group III. Cases involving a possible crasis, 19.

Crisis demanded, 1.

Crisis impossible, 15.

Article 1 ἀρπάζεται θώρα; Mil. 88. 15 e. g. κέκληται τῷ ὀνόματι, Epi. Zach. 15.
Doubtful, 1.

To these may be added the following:

For crasis, βιάσασθαι γοῦν¹ προσήκει, Lyd. 26.

Against crasis ἐγὼ οὖν τὴν νύμφην, Epi. Zach. 15.

Result: clear cases of genuine hiatus, 16. Evidence against crasis, 16-2.

Group IV. Cases of hiatus not avoidable by elision, etc., 6 (all Form 2), e. g.

παρέχει ἰχθῦς, Epi. Proc. 36.

Summary: in all groups together there are found 44 certain cases of genuine hiatus, 2.81 + % of the total number of clausulae read, 1563.

III. JOHN ELEEMON.

Two publications of comparatively recent years have given us critical editions of two works, both hagiographical, in which the accentual rhythm has been carefully regarded in editing the text. The one is the Life of St. Tychon by John Eleemon (ed. Usener: Der Heilige Tychon, 1907); the other is an Encomium on St. Therapon by an anonymous writer (ed. Deubner: De Incubatione, 1900). In the Life of St. Tychon, the rhythm is remarkable in that Form 2 alone is used in 89.8 + % of all clausulae; the other type of clausula commonly regarded as regular (Form 4) occurs in only 5. + % of the clausulae,² while the (commonly) irregular Form 3 occurs in 4. + % of all cases. This makes it exceedingly probable that only Form 2 is here strictly regular; the common use of this Form together with the almost constant use of a final accentual dactyl are the essential factors of the rhythm. I have not attached as much importance to the final dactyl as did the editor, and have accordingly counted some clausulae which are not so indicated in the printing.³ Considering the nature of the rhythm, we can use with confidence only those cases which involve Form 2.

¹ γοῦν had become practically an independent word, and the case proves little for elision or crasis in general.

² Even some of those which are apparently Form 4 can be read as Form 2, e. g. πάντως εἶναι φιλόανθρωπος, —2, 18-19.

³ On the other hand I have disregarded some of the editor's clausulae, on the ground that the sense pause is too weak to allow us to *expect* a clausula.

Group I. Cases involving a possible elision, 10.

Elision demanded, 2.

Elision impossible, 3.

δέ 2 e. g. *μυρία δ' ἀκήκοε*—¹ 4, 14.

0

Others 0

3 e. g. *αἰτήματα ἔλαβον*,—21, 11.

Doubtful, 5.

Result: clear cases of genuine hiatus, 3. Evidence against elision, 3-2.

Group II. Cases involving ν movable, 26. No case favors elision as against ν movable; 19 must certainly be kept as they stand.

After ε 12 *ἐφύτευσεν ἄμπελον*—10, 1.

" ι 7 *εὐρήκασιν ἅπαντας*—17, 23.

Doubtful, 7.

Result: 19-0 in favor of ν movable as against elision.

Group III. Cases involving a possible crasis, 58.

Crisis demanded, 4.

Crisis impossible, 36.

Article 1 *ἐκδιδύσκει θαίματα*—1, 9-10. 14 e. g. *ἐκτίνει τὸ δόγμα*,—14, 16.καί 2 e. g. *χαμπεπῶς κατελῶς*, 38, 7. 22 e. g. *ξηρὸν τε καὶ ἀνικμον*—10, 17.πρό 1 *μέλλοντα προὔλεγεν*. 10, 27. 0

Doubtful, 18.

Result: clear cases of genuine hiatus, 36. Evidence against crasis, 36-4.³

Group IV. Cases involving a possible aphaeresis, 1.

λόγω μὴ ἔφερεν,—8, 28. The hiatus is to be kept.

Group V. Cases of hiatus not avoidable by elision, etc., 3.

ἀκερδῆς ἢ ἀνόητος—8, 9-10.

ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχονσι—22, 19.

ἐκδυσάμενοι αὐτήν—³ 26, 1.

Summary: in all groups together there are found 42 certain cases of genuine hiatus, 3.1 + % of the total number of clausulae read, 1316.

IV. ANONYMOUS ENCOMIUM ON ST. THERAPON.

The rhythm is here (again) of the common sort which recognizes two regular Forms of clausulae, and is remarkably regular.

¹ Clausulae followed by a dash are printed as clausulae by the editor, others not. Punctuation, if found in the text, is given in each case.

² Eleven cases involving crasis were found printed as clausulae by the editor, but omitted from this discussion as noted above (p. 193, n. 3); they add nothing to the evidence here given.

³ The order of these words must be reversed, as suggested by Usener, in order to read a correct clausula.

Number of clausulae read, 645; Form 2, 487 (75.5 + %); Form 4, 127 (19.6 + %); non-conforming, 31 (4.8 + %).¹

Group I. Cases involving a possible elision, 14.

Elision demanded, 3.	Elision impossible, 10.
Prep. 1 τὸ σῶμα δι' ἔλεον.— ² 23, 9.	ο
Others 2 e. g. ὄνομ' ἑμῶν. ³ 10, 1-2.	10 e. g. ταῦτα ὅστ' α, 7, 15.
Doubtful, 1.	

Result: clear cases of genuine hiatus, 10. Evidence against elision, 10-3.

Group II. Cases involving ν movable, 11.

Elision demanded, 0.	Mov. cons. must be retained, 9.
	ε ελχεν ἑτέρα 17, 9.
	ι τοῖς ἱστοροῦσιν ἐνδίδωσι—1, 5-6.
Doubtful, 2.	

Result: 9-0 in favor of ν movable as against elision.

Group III. Cases involving a possible crasis, 28.

Crasis demanded, 1.	Crasis impossible, 25.
Article 1 . . . Φλωρίνος δὲ τοῦνομα,— ⁴ 12, 2. 17 e. g. προτρέχει τὸ ἔλεος,—23, 14.	
καί ο	8 e. g. σώματά τε καὶ αἵματα,—4, 6-7.
Doubtful, 2.	

Result: clear cases of genuine hiatus, 25. Evidence against crasis, 25-1.

Group IV. Cases involving a possible aphaeresis, 7.

Aphaeresis demanded, 0.	Aphaeresis impossible, 7, e. g.
	ψιθυρισμοῦ ἐπακούοντα.—25, 13-14.
	ἐκ μέσου ἐγένετο.—20, 7.

Result: clear cases of genuine hiatus, 7. Evidence against aphaeresis, 7-0.

Group V. Cases of hiatus not avoidable by elision, etc., 8, e. g.

Form 2 . . . ἐλαίῳ ἀλείφθητι.—16, 9.
Form 4 . . . ποιμένος μὴ ἀποδράμοι [τε]—27, 14.

Summary: in all groups together there are found 50 certain cases of genuine hiatus, 7.7 + % of the total number of clausulae read, 645.⁵

¹ The editor's division into commata has been departed from on the same principle as in the Life of St. Tychon (p. 193, n. 3).

² The use of the dash is the same as in the preceding presentation.

³ The words are an adaptation of biblical language, ὄνομά σου, LXX, Cant. I 3.

⁴ Cf. Μαρία τὸ ὄνομα,—17, 9.

⁵ Among 12 clausulae which are omitted on the grounds stated above, only one deserves special notice, as showing a clear case of crasis:

τέλος εἰς τοῦδαφος—12, 15.

V. ARISTAENETUS.

The accentual rhythm is very plainly present in the Erotic Epistles of this writer.¹ All the letters in the collection of Hercher have been included in this test; among 2297 clausulae counted there are found 1260 (54.8 + %) of Form 2, 647 (28.1 + %) of Form 4, and 378 (16.9 + %) non-conforming clausulae.²

Group I. Cases involving a possible elision, 67.

Elision demanded, 30.		Elision impossible, 28.	
τε	3 e. g. ἐφίλουν θ' ἡδέως, II, 16.	1	οἶα τε ἦν, I, 6.
δέ	4 e. g. ἀγριότητα δ' ἐξορίζων. I, 15.	11	e. g. σχηματιζόμενος δὲ ὑπόκρισιν II, 3.
Prep.	14 e. g. τὰ δρώμενα παρ' ἐκείνης, II, 18.	2	e. g. ἡράσθης ἀπὸ ὧν λέγεις, II, 17.
Others	9 e. g. ὦ μέλισσ' ἐμή, II, 21.	14	e. g. εἰκός γε, ὦ φίλτατε I, 22.
Doubtful, 9.			

Result: clear cases of genuine hiatus, 28. Evidence for elision, 30-28.

Group II. Cases involving ν movable, 89.

Elision demanded, 14.		Mov. cons. must be retained, 69.	
ε	10 e. g. πέφυχ' ἱππότης. I, 8.	41	e. g. ἀπέσωσεν εἰσδραμόυσα. I, 5.
ι	4 e. g. ἐρωτός ἐστ' ἀρχή II, 12.	28	e. g. μειονεκτοῦσιν αἱ κόραι I, 10.
Doubtful, 6.			

Result: 69-14 in favor of ν movable as against elision.

Group III. Cases involving a possible crasis, 49.

Crasis demanded, 11.		Crasis impossible, 31.	
Article	2 e. g. ἐβόμβει σοι τῶτα, II, 13.	23	e. g. πέπανται μὲν τὰ ἀνθη II, 1.
καί	9 e. g. νέος κάρωτικός I, 25.	8	e. g. ἀφῇ καὶ ἀνέλγῃ I, 10.
Doubtful, 7.			

Result: clear cases of genuine hiatus, 31. Evidence against crasis, 31-11.

Group IV. Cases involving a possible aphaeresis, 4.

Aphaeresis demanded, 2.		Aphaeresis impossible, 2.	
οὐ μέντοι 'ς ὑπερφηάνειαν, ³ I, 11.		ἐπισιτίασθαι τι ἐκείθεν. I, 3.	
ὁμφακίζει, ἔμπεδόκλεις, ⁴ II, 7.		πάνν ἐπαγωγόν. I, 1.	

Result: clear cases of genuine hiatus, 2. Evidence as to aphaeresis, neutral.

¹ Ed. Hercher, Epistolographi Graeci.

² Of this number 10.3 + % are of Form 3, which is in general the most frequent of the irregular Forms.

³ This case is complicated by the possibility of ὑπερφηάνειαν.

⁴ i. e. ἔμπεδόκλεις.

Group V. Hiatus not avoidable by elision, etc., 8, e. g.

Form 2 . . . στέρνω ἀρμόζοντες, II, 19.

Form 4 . . . εἴη μοι Ἀφροδίτη. II, 13.

Note. Four cases of this sort occurring in non-conforming clausulae are excluded from the list of certain cases of hiatus.

Summary: in all groups together there are found 69 certain cases of genuine hiatus, 3.00 + % of the total number of clausulae read, 2297.

VI. ZOSIMUS.

The first and fourth books of the History (Corp. Scr. Hist. Byz.) have been used; within these books 3487 clausulae were found, distributed as follows: Form 2, 1735 (49.7 + %); Form 4, 1141 (32.7 + %); non-conforming clausulae, 611 (17.5 + %).¹

Group I. Cases involving a possible elision, 91.

Elision demanded, 22.

Elision impossible, 51.

τε 6 e. g. ὅπλα τ' ἀνέλαβον, 234, 6.²

12 e. g. ἔργον τε ἀπτεσθαι 219, 14-15.

δέ 5 e. g. παιδαγωγῆσαι δ' ὀλίγους 198, 12.

8 e. g. ἦννε δὲ οὐδέν' 238, 7.

Prep. 6 e. g. ἐκπέμπειν ἀνθ' ἑαυτῶν, 209, 4.

3 e. g. ἀνεχώρησαν ἐπὶ οἴκου. 30, 17.

Others 5 e. g. ἤγετ' εἰς κρίσιν, 236, 24.

28 e. g. τότε ἡ Πώμη 43, 11.

Doubtful, 18.

Result: clear cases of genuine hiatus, 51. Evidence against elision, 51-22.

Group II. Cases involving ν movable, 92.

Elision demanded, 6.

Mov. cons. must be retained, 73.

ε 2 e. g. γέγον' ἔλιν, 59, 6.

27 e. g. ἔδοξεν εἶναι' 231, 10.

ι 4 e. g. γράμμασ' ἐχρήτο, 238, 17.

46 e. g. πόλεσιν ἐπίοντων, 200, 21.

Doubtful, 13.

Result: evidence in favor of ν movable as against elision, 73-6.

Group III. Cases involving a possible crasis, 42.

Crisis demanded, 8.

Crisis impossible, 20.

Article 3 e. g. περιέπλει τάκεισε, 230, 7.

11 e. g. τὸ δραστήριον τοῦ ἀνδρός, 237, 4.

καί 4 e. g. πεζῶν τε χιππέων, 41, 15.

9 e. g. χεῖρα καὶ ἐπληξεν. 236, 1.

πρὸ 1 τοῦτο προῦχώρησεν, 227, 8-9. ο

Doubtful, 14.

Result: clear cases of genuine hiatus, 20. Evidence against crasis, 20-8.

¹ Among these Form 3 has the greatest single percentage, 7.4 + %.

² References are to page and line in the Corpus.

Group IV. Cases involving a possible aphaeresis, 6.

Aphaeresis demanded, 0.

Aphaeresis impossible, 2.

τύχης ἢ ἐκ προνοίας, 60, 22.

Doubtful, 4.

εὐθὺ εἰς φυγὴν, 46, 1.

Result: clear cases of genuine hiatus, 2. Evidence against aphaeresis, 2-0.

Group V. Cases of hiatus not avoidable by elision, etc., 7.

Form 2, 3 e. g. ἑώρα ὀκνοῦντας 222, 4.

Form 4, 1 ἀπολούμενοι ὀρχησταί, 212, 3.

Irregular, 3.

Summary: in all groups together there are found 74 certain cases of genuine hiatus, 2.12 + % of the total number of clausulae read, 3487.

VII. SYNESIUS.

The text of Epistles I-XLV has been read in Hercher's *Epistolographi Graeci*. Among the 1171 clausulae found in this space the regular Forms 2 and 4 occur as follows: Form 2, 647 times (55.2 + %), Form 4, 255 times (21.7 + %); the non-conforming clausulae amount to 269 (22.5 + %).¹

Group I. Cases involving a possible elision, 67.

Elision demanded, 17.

Elision impossible, 27.

τε 3 e. g. αὐταὶ τ' ἐσκενάζοντο 163 B.

1 προήγαγόν τε αὐτόν, 174 A.

δέ 4 e. g. σχετλιαζόντων δ' ἡμῶν 161 A.

9 e. g. ἐγκλημα δὲ ὑμῖν, 172 B.

Prep. 7 e. g. ἄλλος ἐπ' ἄλλῳ 166 A.

0

Others 3 e. g. ἐχοιμ' ἂν ὑπομνήματα. 167 A. 17 e. g. τὸν ἄνδρα ἡμίγυνον, 184 D.

Doubtful, 23.

Result: clear cases of genuine hiatus, 27. Evidence against elision, 27-17.

Group II. Cases involving ν movable, 32.

Elision demanded, 4.

Mov. cons. must be retained, 16.

ε 3 e. g. ἀπέλιψ' ἡμᾶς, 164 B.

6 e. g. οἶδεν ἡ Δίκη, 185 D.

ι 1 ὁρῶσ' ἄπερ ἐστι, 157 D.

10 e. g. σπάταλός ἐστιν οὗτος, 185 B.

Doubtful, 12.

Result: evidence for ν movable as against elision, 16-4.

Group III. Cases involving a possible crasis, 29.

Crasis demanded, 9.

Crasis impossible, 17.

Article 5 e. g. ἡπίστατο τάληθές 184 B.

4 e. g. ἐξετάζειν τὰ ἐκγονα, 157 D.

καὶ 4 e. g. αὐτοῦ τε κάμου. 185 B.

13 e. g. γίνονται καὶ εὐμήχανοι, 184 D.

Doubtful, 3.

Result: clear cases of genuine hiatus, 17. Evidence against crasis, 17-9.

¹ One half of all these cases are of Form 3 (11.0 + %).² ἄπερ without stress.

Group IV. Cases of hiatus not avoidable by elision, etc., 7.

Form 2, 6 e. g. τοῦ μὴ ἀμαρτεῖν, 184 A.

Not regular, 1.

Summary: in all groups together there are found 50 certain cases of genuine hiatus, 4.26 + % of the total number of clausulae read, 1171.

VIII. GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS.

Oratio IV, Contra Iulianum, has been used for this test;¹ among 2105 clausulae found in this oration 1190 (42.3 + %) conform to Form 2, 848 (30.2 + %) to Form 4, while 769 (27.2 + %) are non-conforming clausulae.² The rhythm is therefore unusually irregular, but is present without a possibility of a doubt: the testimony of the rhythmical law will, as usual, be rigidly followed in the following presentation.

Group I. Cases involving a possible elision, 136.

Elision demanded, 45.		Elision impossible, 45.	
τε	4 e. g. λέγειν θ' ὁμοῦ, LXXXIV.	8 e. g. ἡλὺς τε ἰστάμενος, XIX.	
δέ	5 e. g. πολλοῖς οὐδ' ἐγένετο. CXXIII.	15 e. g. ἀποκηρύττω δὲ ὁμοῦ, XI.	
Prep.	21 e. g. κίνησιν ἐπ' αὐτόν, LXXXVIII.	3 e. g. ἡ αὐτὴ κατὰ ὑμᾶς Ἦρα, CXVI.	
Others	15 e. g. ἡνίκ' ἐπλατύνθημεν, XXXII.	19 e. g. ἀποστερεῖτε ἡμᾶς, CV.	
Doubtful, 46.			

Result: clear cases of genuine hiatus, 45. Evidence regarding elision, neutral.

Group II. Cases involving ν movable, 38.

Elision demanded, 3.		Mov. cons. must be retained, 27.	
ε ι	παρελύπησ' ἡμᾶς, XXXVII.	9 e. g. ἐπραττεν ἡδὴ, XCV.	
ι	2 e. g. τοῖς δαίμοσ' ἐπιφημίζοντες. XLVII.	18 e. g. χρήμασιν ἀφιέμενος; CXVI.	
Doubtful, 8.			

Result: 27-3 in favor of ν movable as against elision.

Group III. Cases involving a possible crasis, 166.

Crisis demanded, 20.		Crisis impossible, 111.	
Article	15 e. g. ὑπεραλγῶν τὰ δελφοῦ, XLV.	33 e. g. καθιέρωσις ἡ ἐπί- δοσις. XXV.	
καί	4 e. g. θανμασίον κἀρεθουσίων, ³ LXXXVIII.	74 e. g. θεολογικὰς τε καὶ ἠθικὰς. CXV.	
πρό	ι νόμον προῦβάλλετο, XCIII.	4 e. g. μιᾶς προεβάλλετο, XCIV.	
Doubtful, 35.			

Result: clear cases of genuine hiatus, 111. Evidence against crasis, 111-20.

¹ Migne, Patrologia Graeca, 35.

² The greatest single percentage of non-conforming clausulae is in Form 1 (10.7 + %).

³ i. e. καὶ Ἀρεθουσίων.

Group IV. Cases involving a possible aphaeresis, 3.

Aphaeresis demanded, 0.

Aphaeresis impossible, 1.

συστελλούση εἰς τὸ τριβάνιον. LXXII.

Doubtful, 2.

Result: one clear case of genuine hiatus. Evidence against aphaeresis, 1-0.

Group V. Cases of hiatus not avoidable by elision, etc., 23, e. g.

Form 2 *οὐ πολὺ πρὸ ἡμῶν*, LXXII.Form 4 *διανοεῖται περὶ ἡμῶν*, LXI.

Irregular or doubtful, 7.

Summary: in all groups together there are found 174 certain cases of genuine hiatus, 6.89 + % of the total number of clausulae read, 2105.

CONCLUSION.

In looking over the situation in these eight writers, it becomes immediately evident that their attitude towards hiatus was a strange one indeed from the point of view of classical usage. That they knew the traditional rule regarding the avoidance of hiatus, and conscientiously tried to follow it cannot be a matter of doubt.¹ But their conception of hiatus itself must have been an entirely different one from that which was current in the time when Attic was spoken as well as a literary language. In the earlier time hiatus had meant not merely the juxtaposition of two vowel sounds between successive words, but the unavoidable juxtaposition of such sounds. When the language was spoken there was no hiatus where it could be avoided by elision, crasis, aphaeresis or a movable consonant. Accordingly there was no genuine hiatus in such a phrase as *Kûros δὲ ἦλθεν*, except as a matter of writing; the sound of the phrase was *Kûros δ' ἦλθεν*, irrespective of the manner of writing.² Similarly in cases where crasis or aphaeresis might prevent the clash of vowels, there was no hiatus in the reading or speaking of the words. We may not be able to say exactly in every case whether elision, crasis or aphaeresis are permissible, but we may be sure that they were regularly introduced when the situation justified their use.

¹ Cf., in the case of one writer, Kirsten, *Quaest. Chor.*, pp. 25-35.

² There is abundant evidence in classical inscriptions to show that the indication of elision in writing prose and poetry as well was largely a matter of chance. Cf. Meisterhans, *Gram. der Att. Inschriften*, §§ 24, 25.

This narrows down the number of genuine cases of hiatus to a very small number, namely those cases in which the vowels retain their own individuality in speaking, not being affected by any of the processes of combination or elimination. Such a criterion might logically be followed in the printing of all our classical Greek prose, as has been done in the case of Demosthenes by Friedrich Blass. This method certainly has the merit of consistency, and, if the Greek is to look as it sounded, there is no escape from it.

Each and every one, therefore, of these Byzantine writers is found repeatedly allowing hiatus to be read as such in cases where genuine hiatus would be inconceivable to an Athenian of Demosthenes' time. For it must be remembered that the accentual rhythm depended for its effect upon its sound, whether it was used to adorn a public oration or a historical narrative. On the other hand, the legitimate remedy for such cases is not always disregarded, for elision and crasis are found in clausulae not infrequently. The situation seems unreasonable at first glance—in fact impossible. A doubt may arise as to whether we can allow the evidence of the rhythm alone to drive us to such a conclusion. A few striking examples may show to what we are forced.

Φλωρίνος δὲ τοῦνομα (Therap. 12, 2).

ἀπαγγεῖλαι δ' οὐ ῥῥῥῥῥῥῥ (Aris. II, 4).

χαμερπῶς κατελῶς (Tych. 38, 7).

δυνασθαι παρ' ὑμῖν (Proc. Ep. 14).

ἀρπάσσεται θῶπλα (Chor. Mil. 88).

νόμονς προῦβάλλετο (Greg. Naz. Jul. 93).

cf. Μαρία τὸ ὄνομα (id. 17, 9).

“λήξω δὲ ὁμῶς (id. I, 1).

“ἄμα καὶ ἄλαλον (id. 35, 10).

“ταῦτα παρὰ ὑμῖν (id. 92).

“καταθεμένους τὰ ὄπλα, (id. 5, 6).

“μῆς προεβάλλετο (id. 94).

If the evidence of the rhythmical law is to be followed, we meet with such inconsistencies at every turn. There is one escape—namely to treat the cases in question by the standards of classical usage, and consider every clausula which on this principle does not comply with the accentual law as one of the non-conforming clausulae which are found in every writer. But the evidence of statistics is very strongly against this. To illustrate: in the Epistles of Aristaenetos there are found only 81 cases of the irregular Form 1 among 2297 clausulae (3.5 + %); to these 19 more cases must be added if elision be regularly introduced. In Zosimus 141 cases of Form 1 are found among 3487 clausulae (4.0 + %); to these 27 must be added if uniform elision is to be

employed. In Choricus 25 cases of Form 1 are found among 1563 clausulae ($1.5 + \%$); to these must be added 10 cases on the principle of uniform elision. In the Laudatio Therapontis Form 1 would rise from 14 ($2.1 + \%$) to 23. Further it is frequently found that consistent elision will add more cases to the non-conforming category than to the regular Forms 2 and 4. For example uniform elision in Zosimus would add 51 cases to the number of non-conforming clausulae, while only 22 would be brought into the number of regular Forms.¹ It would therefore be extremely violent to adopt such measures in the matter of elision. The case is even more convincing in regard to crasis, as may readily be seen by reference to the statistics given above on each writer.

But the thesis here maintained can be justified on more general grounds. The explanation of the whole situation seems to lie in this, that we are dealing with a literary dialect rather than a spoken language. The Greek which we see was a purely artificial survival—a stiff unchanging copy of Attic, from which the vulgar tongue was now moving farther and farther away. One kind of Greek was spoken on the street, a different kind was taught in the schools of rhetoric. The change had gone so far that to those who could appreciate the difference, the immortal Attic was a different tongue. The living Greek could not, in the nature of things, be without some effect on the Greek they wrote—witness the use of a rhythm based on word accent—but it was to them the debased phase of the language, and was not regarded as a worthy means of literary expression. There was no one to teach them to speak the real Attic of Demosthenes' day; they could read it in books only; and they must have read it as it was written, and understood it to have been read so. They therefore saw all cases of written hiatus as genuine hiatus; they saw some elisions and some crases indicated; they saw and marveled not, but trustingly received what was offered. When they wrote, therefore, they modeled their language on a *written* Plato or Demosthenes or Isocrates, with the result that they were blind to the real nature of hiatus. It is not surprising that men of letters wrote by the book; the surprising thing is that they read their

¹ When this is not the case, the reason is to be found in the presence of a considerable number of prepositions in clausulae, which are almost always to be read with elision when possible in order to satisfy the law of the rhythm.

books in such an undiscerning way. The Greek of their day must have told them plainly enough that elision, at least, was to be used whenever possible, but they certainly did not write their clausulae on such a principle. Is it possible that a perverse spirit of hostility to the vulgar language moved them to reject its testimony?

This strange situation may well be compared with the condition prevailing in literary Latin prose of the same period. The accentual rhythm came into use in Latin at an earlier time than that at which it was found by the Greek writers, and allowed the same regular forms of accentual clausulae as did the Greek. It was developed from the quantitative rhythm of earlier centuries by a natural growth. Now the quantitative clausulae of Cicero knew no more hiatus than did the hexameters of Vergil; but the accentual rhythm reversed this practice, and recognized no elision. Here again, as in Greek, it must have been brought about by the study of the written language that the classical Latin prose was spoken by the schoolmasters of a later time *as written* (just as we at the present day are accustomed to do), and thus the existence of elision in prose was forgotten, or at least ignored.

In closing reference may be made to the Greek accentual poetry known as Political Verses. Much of this poetry, if it may be so called, has come down to us, but its late date (mostly tenth century and after) detracts from its value as testimony for the earlier Byzantine period. But in the form and treatment of the literary language the variation from century to century was slight, and the attitude of these writers towards hiatus may well be noticed in connection with the matter before us. It is found that the tolerance of hiatus is a matter which varies with different writers. In Constantinus Manasses, *Compendium Chronicum*, (Corp. Scr. Hist. Byz.), vv. 2500-2700 there occurs no case of hiatus, while elision and crasis are to be occasionally noted. One case of hiatus was found in another passage, (v. 2306 δύο ἔτη), but it is clear that this writer does not admit hiatus of any sort except in very rare cases, and he regularly elides when hiatus can be avoided in that way. In John Tzetzes, *Historiarum Chiliades*, (ed. Kiessling), I, 1-204, 17 cases of hiatus occur; of these five are justified by their position in the caesura of the verse. One is a quotation of a familiar phrase: ὦρα ὄνον, v. 130. Two are cases of hiatus not avoidable by elision, etc.

Κραναοῦ ὑπάρχων, 173.

τούτου Ἀλνάττης, 155.

The nine remaining cases are :

1. ἔχειν ὥτια δνου, 113.
2. Ταρβαῖός τε ὁ στρατηγός, 74.
3. καὶ δνομα, 67.
4. καὶ Ἀθήνης, 173.
5. ἐς τὸ Ἡραῖον, 37.
6. Κροῖσος ὁ Ἀλνάττω, 1.
7. ὁ Ἐρεχθεύς, 175.
8. ὁ Ἐριχθόνιος, 172.
9. καὶ τὰ ἀνάκτορα, 161.

Two of these (1 and 2) could be remedied by a natural elision, the remainder by crasis, but the meter requires that they be read with hiatus. Here, then, we have an example of inconsistency which may be compared with the conditions which have been found to prevail in the eight prose writers treated above.

HENRY B. DEWING.

ROBERT COLLEGE, CONSTANTINOPLE.

IV.—BUDDHA AS TATHĀGATA.

One of the commonest designations of the Buddha is Tathāgata, explained as meaning one who has gone the way of all flesh, etc., and derived from *tathā*, "so", and either *gata* or *āgata*, "gone", or "arrived". How and why "so gone" came to mean the Buddha is, however, not obvious. Childers supposed that it meant at first any sentient being, as one who goes the way others go, and that Buddha was simply the sentient being *par excellence*, like Son of Man.

In the older parts of the epic there is not much difference, so far as connotation is involved, between *yathāgata* and *tathāgata*. In both the meaning lies upon the surface. As *pratijagmur yathāgatam* means "they returned as they had come" (Mbh. 3, 57, 40; cf. ib. 105, 19; 107, 8, etc.), so *Nalaṁ dr̥ṣṭvā tathāgatam* means "on seeing Nala in this pass", that is, "returned" (3, 77, 6); just as *taṁ apaśyaṁs tathāyāntam* means "they saw him so-coming", "returning" (3, 56, 23), as previously described, to where he had been before.

But as *tathāvidha*, "of such sort", through evil associations inclines to imply an unhappy sort (*vilapantiṁ tathāvidhāṁ*, "weeping, so wretched", 3, 59, 16), so *tathāgata* attaches itself by a sort of fatal predilection to what is ill, *tathāgatam pāpam upāiti siddham* (5, 42, 24), etc., so that, when the poet describes horrors, he sums up the description of a furious battle with a *tathāgate*, "in so (grievous) a condition" was the field of battle (7, 186, 18):

"Then darkness horrible, and noise profound—

"Nor earth, nor sky, nor anything around

"Was visible, so (grievous) was the pass" (*tathāgate*).

The same mournful association often characterizes *tathābhūta*. In Rām. 7, 30, 20 (South Indian text), Indra is very wretched, and Brahman, "seeing him in so (sad) a condition", *tathābhūtam*, says, etc. Less often does *tathā* tincture the fluid meaning of other compounds. But we may note its application in a few

cases. For example, a hero falls in battle "like a fire extinguished", and "seeing him so (sadly) fallen", *tathāpatitam*, his followers rally to his assistance (7, 49, 16).

But the connotation of *tathāgata* (when it has any) is always the same, whereas *tathābhūta* varies, so that the latter may refer to something good or bad. Thus a sacrifice *tathābhūta*, in R. 7, 93, 1, is a magnificent sacrifice; while a maid *tathābhūta*, ib. 7, 2, 19, is in a very bad state indeed, the worst state a maid can be in. If this were true of *tathāgata*, one might say that the circumstances gave the implication. One who weeps is of course in a wretched state; one felled in battle is likewise wretched; and "in such a state" is all that the word means in itself. In that case, however, it would be used indifferently of joyous and sad states, like *tathābhūta*. But *tathāgata*, like the tower of Pisa, has leaned so far over in one direction that it does not recover itself. Or it is like "so so", neutral in form but unmistakably depreciatory in effect. "How is your health?" "Oh, so so", which means that sympathy is due. Thus "seeing the army *tathāgatam*" is "in so bad a shape", never in good shape (7, 90, 5). Similarly, of the individual warrior who faints and falls and is nearly dead; *taṁ vāi tathāgatam dṛṣtvā*, "seeing him in so wretched condition" (7, 122, 57). It is almost as plain as the following *tathā kṛcchragatam dṛṣtvā*, "seeing him in so miserable a pass" (7, 133, 37, and again in 7, 143, 31). No literal meaning suffices here. The hero is neither "gone" nor "returned". He falls where he stood, and in falling he gets into "such a state". This very English phrase approximates to the implication of the Sanskrit. "Such a state as I was in", could be said by one relating his misfortune only.

There is an instance, at 2, 47, 29, which might seem to be opposed to this, but in reality it is not:

*śriyaṁ tathāgatam dṛṣtvā jvalantim iva Pāṇḍave
amarṣavaśam āpanno dahyāmi na tathocitaḥ,*

"The Pandus' wealth has come to such a pass

"That its refulgence burns me, who am wont

"To feel not jealousy".

It is the rival prince, disconcerted by the horrible luck of his adversary, who is speaking. At most, this passage shows the neutral stage, which may be rendered by "come to such a pass".

Another neutral *tathāgata* in a different form is to be found at 2, 6, 4, also from the earlier epic :

*vayaṃ tu satpathaṃ teṣāṃ yātum icchāmahe, prabho,
na tu śakyaṃ tathā gantum yathā tāir niyatātmabhiḥ*

"We cannot *so go* as the old pious kings,
"Although we yearn to walk the path they trod".¹

From this to the regularly "miserable condition", of the battle-scenes, the word passes quite naturally into an adjective euphemistically used of the dead. The misfortune is sometimes formally stated to exist. When the man Ila suddenly became the woman Ilā, it was naturally embarrassing and a little difficult for him (or her), and we are so informed: "This was a grand misfortune for him, beholding himself in so (wretched) a state", *tasya duḥkham mahac cāsid dṛṣṭvā 'tmānaṃ tathāgatam* (R. 7, 87, 16).²

The meaning "dead" for *tathāgata* is found in both epics. In R. 5, 13, 28 (= 26), it is said of Sugrīva, "If he sees Rāma dead, he will renounce life", *Rāmaṃ tathāgataṃ dṛṣṭvā tatas tyakṣyati jīvitaṃ*, just as in the following verses, "will cease to live, if the king is dead", *pañcatvaṃ ca gate rājñi*. In the Mahābhārata: "They went to the place where the king (lay) dead", *yatra rājā tathāgataḥ* (1, 125, 14). So in 12, 146, 26, where the fowler has caused the bird's death: "Then the fowler lamented and blamed his own act, on beholding the bird dead", *dvijaṃ dṛṣṭvā tathāgatam*. Finally, after the king and queen had been burned to death, it became noised abroad, "and when they heard that Prthā was dead", *Prthāṃ śrutvā tathāgatām*, "they lamented greatly; and they lamented also the death, *niryāṇam*, of the king so sadly burned", *tathādagdham* (15, 37, 43). Here *niryāṇa*, exit, death, is really "gone out", as

¹ For *tathāgata* as *tathā + āgata*, compare 5, 34, 20: *anārabhya bhavanti arthāḥ kecin nityaṃ tathā 'gatāḥ : kṛtāḥ puruṣakāro hi bhaved yeṣu nirarthakāḥ*, "Not worthy to be undertaken are certain aims, so unattainable that human effort expended upon them would be useless" (*agata* = *aprāpta*, unattained, unattainable). Yet the usual interpretation would suffice.

² His story told *yathāgatam* is in the Bomb. text *yathāgamam*; 7, 88, 4, of SI. Rām. has the same usage as Mbh. Compare *tathāgatām . . . rudatām*, 6, 114, 89. In 5, 19, 9, *tathāviṣṭām*, describing Sītā wretched, is a doubtful reading, v. l. *athāviṣṭām*. Here also *ihāgata* is "reborn on earth" and *evamgate* is quae cum ita sint (7, 51, 20 and 30), "in such a case".

tathāgata is "gone so" badly. One who is *tathāgata* is "a gone case", with which locution may be compared a "goner", that is, a person (or thing) lost past recovery; also a "feeling of goneness", as a feeling of faintness, may be compared with *tathāgata* of the fainting hero (above).

So far as I have observed, the cases where *tathāgata* is synonymous with *mṛta*, 'dead', occur only in distinctly later parts of the epic: in the scene of the king's death, which, involving the following Suttē scene, is undoubtedly not early, whatever one may think in general of the epic's analysis; in the Buddhistically flavored scene of the fowler (Śānti); in the final catastrophe of Āśrama (both belonging in fact to the pseudo-epic); in one passage of the Rāmāyaṇa in Sundara; and in one late passage, where it occurs as the title of Buddha. In the earlier epic it has the meaning "come (go) so", or "to such a pass", or "come (go) so" (as one as gone), i. e. "returned". This is found in the Gambling-House scene (introduction) and in the old Nala episode. In the middle stage of the epic, represented by the fighting-scenes of Droṇa, as cited above, *tathāgata* is almost "dead", but not quite. In no passage here is the man so described in any other than a wretched but still living state; whereas in the pseudo-epic *tathāgata*, whether translated so or not (for one might insist that the word still meant "wretched", "in such a pass"), actually designates a dead person, as it does not in the earlier epic. As if to crown the epic use, occurs the passage to which I have already referred. After Jābāli has declared that the food given at a funeral feast is wasted, because there is no life beyond (R. 2, 108, 14 f.), the orthodox Rāma, outraged at such language, exclaims (ib. 109, 34, not in B, but in C, and in the Southern version):

*yathā hi coraḥ sa tathā hi Buddhāḥ,
Tathāgataṃ nāstikam atra viddhi,*

"Know that the Buddhist seems a thief;

"An (atheist) without belief, Tathāgata!"

If, as indicated by the extant Buddhist scriptures, Buddha actually designated himself as the Tathāgata, the word could not then have had its latest epic signification! There is, however, the chance that this was an euphemistic title bestowed upon him after his death by followers avoiding to say "dead"; which

would imply that the texts were written long afterwards, when the writers felt no incongruity in making Buddha apply the title to himself. Perhaps, on the other hand, it is more probable that the Buddhistic term is illustrated not by the latest but by the earliest epic use of the word, such as that in the passage cited above, *na tu śakyaṃ tathā gantum yathā tair niyatātmabhiḥ*, which implies that one who "can go", that is a *tathāgata*, is perfected, has walked wholly in the path of the good. A third possibility, that *tathāgata* (as cited above) means "so unattainable" (in virtue), seems quite improbable. Judgment may be left to students of Buddhism, *pramāṇam bhavantas*; but, on the surface, it is thinkable that two tendencies of the word united, and established Buddha both as the One Who is Perfect and as the One Who Died.

E. WASHBURN HOPKINS.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

The Origin of Tragedy, with special reference to the Greek Tragedies. By WILLIAM RIDGEWAY, Cambridge University Press, 1910.

Although Mr. Ridgeway's contention as to the Origin of Tragedy has been before the world for years, now in lectures, now in review-articles, the liveliness of its style, its *verve*, its go, does not allow the edge of interest to grow dull at any page in his new volume. It is a book that I have found it hard to lay down for myself, impossible to take up for others except in the character of a summarist. But even the humble part of a summarist, which I am always happy to discharge in the case of a book that interests me, is not to be lightly assumed, inasmuch as at certain points in his demonstration Mr. Ridgeway himself pauses to gather up the results of his survey and thus anticipates the work of the reporter. Such summaries are a godsend to the indolent reviewer, but after all I must go my own way—*ιδίᾳς ὁδοῦς ζητοῦσι φιλόπονοι φύσεις*.

As an anthropologist Mr. Ridgeway starts from the living present and thrusts aside the dead past. The consecrated tradition he knocks into smithereens, or, to be tragically elegant, *λακτίζει εἰς ἀφάνειαν*. The Dorians did not invent tragedy. Aristotle does not say so on his own authority, but gives it merely as an inference that others have drawn from the use of *δρᾶν* for *πράττειν*. The dialect of the chorus is no proof. The so-called Doric forms <adduced f. i. by Mr. Rogers, A. J. P. XXV 285 foll.> are old Attic. And as for the dithyrambic origin of tragedy, the dithyramb was not Doric to begin with. The first man to compose a dithyramb, to call it a dithyramb and to teach it to others, was, according to Herodotos, Arion, a native of Methymna of Lesbos, and for that matter this 'ox-driving dithyramb', which Pindar claims for Corinth, was not confined to the story of Dionysos, who, in fact, had nothing to do with the real origin of tragedy, which took its rise from the worship of the dead and the propitiation of the same, a worldwide phenomenon. It was on this cult, the cult of heroes such as Adrastus, that the orgiastic cult of the Thracian interloper was grafted. Dionysos and his ribald crew seem to have been part and parcel of a cult intimately connected with the fertilization of the earth, and the modern carnival of Thrace, as described by Mr. Dawkins, is a survival of the ancient Dionysiac worship, fawnskin, foxskin, and all. Similar rude dramas are still performed in Thessaly and at

Skyros. Thrace, we all remember, was famous for its wine. <Indeed, the very name of Maroneia brings with it a gurgling memory of the delicious lines: ὁδμὴ δ' ἡδεῖα ἀπὸ κρητῆρος ὁδῶδει | θεσπεσίη· τότ' ἂν οὖ τοι ἀποσχέσθαι φίλον ἦεν.> The Thracians in the army of Xerxes wore head-dresses of foxskins and moccasins of fawnskins and the Bacchants were Thracian girls. Nor is it strange that this foreign son of Belial should have thrust himself into the place of the local heroes. Similar superimpositions are recorded elsewhere, and we read of Zeus-Amphiaraos, Hermes-Aipyros, Artemis-Orthia. The thymele, according to Mr. Ridgeway, was originally a *bema-bomos*, and the stage was not a *trapeza* for holding the offerings, as Mr. Cook thinks, but a kitchen-dresser used as a temporary stage. <If we only knew the first meaning of *σκηνή*! For if *σκηνή* originally meant a 'plank', the fixed combination ἐπὶ *σκηνῆς*, so much discussed by archaeologists, would be readily accounted for and synecdoche would yield the 'shack' meaning of *σκηνή*, which is nearer the mark than 'tent'.>

There were two altars, Mr. Ridgeway goes on to say, in the primitive theatre, survivals of two centres of adoration, the tomb of the hero and the fire-altar of the god; not always, it is true, the Thracian god, but prevalently the Thracian god. That he was a late intruder is shewn by the fact that no Attic month bore his name and that the four festivals that did bear his name fall at seasons when there is no vintage <but plenty of drink>. One of the festivals, the Anthesteria, was a great festival of the dead and probably the oldest of all.

The satyric drama was originally a gross licentious rite, supposed, like those witnessed by Mr. Dawkins in Thrace and by Mr. Wace in Northern Greece, to have a potent effect on the fertility of women, flocks and fields. Such was the cult of Dionysos and the only true Dionysiac element was the satyric drama, which, with its Sileni and its Satyrs, came down into Greece from Thrace along with the worship of Dionysos. This accounts for the clear separation in origin between the satyric drama and Attic Comedy proper. Tragedy and satyric drama, as regular rituals, were acknowledged and supported by the state, but comedy, which grew out of mere buffoonery, had no claim to respect as a religious ceremony, and accordingly the state did not take it up until after tragedy had been developed into a distinct *genre* of literature and until comedy, which had been developed on the lines of tragedy, was also recognized as a legitimate form of the drama. <From all which it is evident that Mr. Ridgeway does not accept the *ἀγών* theory of comedy, according to which comedy arose from the γεφυρισμός and belongs to τὸ θεῶν as the satyr-drama does to Dionysos (A. J. P. X 383; XVIII 243).>

In treating of the rise of tragedy Mr. Ridgeway takes up the famous account that Aristotle gives of the development. The assertion that tragedy had arisen out of the grotesqueness of the

satyric drama seems to him inconsistent with Aristotle's own penetrating statement in which the tragedians are represented as the natural successors of the epic poets, Iliad and Odyssey bearing the same relation to tragedy that the Margites does to comedy, which, indeed, is the true explanation.

There were tragedians before Thespis and rude dramatic performances, but the performances which Thespis gave at Athens were of an entirely new character. <μυρτος αἰών, says the famous epigram, πολλὰ προσευρήσει χᾶτερα' τὰμὰ δ' ἐμά.> It was this novelty that excited the anger of Solon in the well known anecdote <and one notes the curious perpetuation of the prejudice against dramatic performances in Solon's remote descendant, Plato>. But the offence of Thespis, according to Mr. Ridgeway, did not consist so much in the impersonation of gods and heroes as in the performance for sport or doubtless also for gain, and that not at some hallowed spot but in any profane place. In like manner the mysteries and miracle plays of the Middle Ages, originally held in church in honour of some holy person and for the edification of the faithful, were transformed into a true form of dramatic literature. <The resistance to such secularization has a very modern illustration in the refusal of the performers of the Oberammergau Passion Play to profane it by reproduction in such an unhallowed spot as New York. The theatre of Oberammergau is really only an extension, as it were, of the church, where the performance begins>.

'Tragedy', as Mr. Ridgeway sums it up (p. 70), 'is really a combination of the lyrical outburst of spontaneous grief for the dead and the heroic lay in which the deeds and trials of hero and heroine were recited in narrative form. In the fully developed tragedy the lyrics sung by the chorus represent the immemorial laments for the dead, whilst the messenger's recitals and the dialogue of the dramatis personae correspond to the narrative and speeches of the epos'.

Mr. Ridgeway next proceeds to attack the much discussed name of tragedy. τραγωδία is a goatsong—<with apologies to Miss Harrison, who derives τραγωδία from τραγεῖν>, and a goatsong is either a song about a goat or a song sung by a goat, <and in recent American political slang a song sung by a goat would be pathetic enough to satisfy all the conditions of tragedy>. Then there is the τραγικός χορός to be considered, a chorus that celebrates a goat or a chorus composed of goats. The theory that the name arose from the circumstance that a goat was the prize in the early tragic contest does not hold water. The first tragic competition was established by Peisistratos B. C. 535, and the τραγικός χορός at Sikyon was much earlier. Bentley's view that the song of the goats means the song of the satyrs who appeared in caprine form finds no favor with Mr. Ridgeway. In Thracian representations the satyrs have the ears, tails and even the feet of horses. Next after man, says Aristotle, the horse

is the most lustful of all animals. The goat, however, is a good third and in later times the satyrs were undoubtedly represented in caprine form. Still, it seems to Mr. Ridgeway unlikely that both the terms tragedy and satyric drama would have been adopted from the satyrs, especially as the very essence of tragedy was already long in use before the introduction of Dionysos and his satyrs.

Hereupon follows a long discussion of Mr. Farnell's paper on the Megala Dionysia and the origin of Tragedy in which the distinguished author of *Greek Cults* criticizes the main theory of Mr. Ridgeway. According to Mr. Farnell, the origin of tragedy is to be sought in an ancient European mummary, a winter drama of the season in which the black personage Dionysos Melanagis or Melanthos killed Xanthos the Fair One. But for nature myths, once made fashionable by Max Müller, Mr. Ridgeway has scant respect. 'It is easy', he says, 'to turn any story or name, ancient or modern, into a nature myth', and he refers to Dr. Littledale's classical article in which Max Müller himself was turned into a solar myth. <But these nature myths will not down. The heliacal interpretation of the story of Odysseus, of which I made mock some years ago (*A. J. P.* XXIX 117), has emerged again in Menrad's new book, *Der Urmythus des Odysseus u. seine dichterische Erneuerung: Des Sonnengottes Erdenfahrt.*>

Be that as it may, our brilliant Irish scholar contends that Dionysos was not a goat god when he entered Greece, but a bull god, that he had no monopoly of goatskins, black or other, that goatskins formed the ordinary dress in primitive times, as indeed the ancient *βαίτη* is a common article of attire in Greece even to this day, and that the *τραγικὸς χορὸς* mentioned by Herodotos as performed B. C. 600 was named after this dress.

After a recapitulation of the points already made (pp. 92-3), Mr. Ridgeway in his third chapter, by way of reinforcing his theory that Greek tragedy did not arise merely in the cult of a particular deity, but rather from beliefs respecting the dead as widespread as the human race itself, takes us to Hindustan and to the Sanscrit literature of its Aryan conquerors, to the Sacred Plays of Tibet and Mongolia, the Malay Drama, the Drama of the Veddas of Ceylon and the Kirikoraha at Bendiagalge, and then pauses for another survey of the path already trod.

The fourth chapter deals with the survivals of the Primitive Type in Extant Greek Tragedies, and as Greek tragedies have to do with death mainly, Mr. Ridgeway has little difficulty in finding evidence that tragedy arose from the worship of the dead and that the only Dionysiac element in the drama is the satyric play.

But before passing to the important closing chapter on the Expansion of Tragedy, I must say a word about a sad disillusionment of my own, what may be called in the language of the syntactician an *expergefacient* ἀρ' ἦν.

In the Preface to his Choephoroi Mr. Verrall mentions his debt to Professor Ridgeway for the hint out of which has been developed the essay on the scene of the Recognition: 'important', he adds modestly, 'if anything in this volume is such'. (Cf. A. J. P. XIV 398). The hint is the racial peculiarity of the Pelopid hair and foot, a racial peculiarity that effectively disposes of the cheap sneer of Euripides at the work of his great predecessor. It is a hint that Mr. Tucker has also taken in his edition of the play, though, as Mr. Ridgeway complains, without acknowledgment of the source. The explanation, as stated by Mr. Verrall, had a certain fascination for me, having lived all my life in constant presence of an alien race in which hair and foot are marked peculiarities, so that I was prepared to accept enthusiastically Mr. Verrall's statement that Orestes and Electra were octoroons. 'Ebo-shin' and 'gizzard-foot' were familiar words in the mouth of that typical Virginian, Henry A. Wise, who was a close observer of racial peculiarities and taught the youths of my generation to distinguish between the 'mulatto' and the 'molungeon'. To a people jealous of their blood, these things were matters of prime moment. No wonder then, that, carried away by Mr. Verrall, whom I am always happy to follow when I can, the standing phrase *ξανθὸς Μενέλαος* seemed to be a strong confirmation of the theory, as I have pointed out elsewhere (A. J. P. XXXI 135). Menelaus, unlike Agamemnon, harked back to his white grandam Hippodameia, and passed for a white man; and it was his light complexion that secured for him the hand of Helen, really a goddess of light. But in Mr. Ridgeway's exposition of his own theory Orestes and Electra are of the blonde Achaean race from the North, and thus differ from the dark aboriginal people of Argolis. So it seems that Mr. Verrall has turned the Irish hint round and that I have been guilty of following one of the *idola tribus*. Still, I am happy to think that I need not abandon my theory as to *ξανθὸς Μενέλαος*, for according to Dr. Brooks, it is much more likely that our *μαλθακὸς αἰχμητής* should have harked back to a white male ancestor than to a white grandam.

In this last chapter, the Expansion of Tragedy, Mr. Ridgeway has some interesting things to say, nothing more interesting than his explanation of what seems to be the strange repugnance of the Danaids to marriage with their cousins, especially strange in view of this form of alliance in the Attic society of the fourth century. The Danaids, however, it seems, represent the earlier period of exogamous marriage, when succession passed through the female line, the *ancien régime* that held its own so long in Egypt <and, according to accounts, has left its traces to this day in Lesbos, the home of Sappho>. It is this same succession that had been the ancient practice at Athens and explains the rebellion of the Danaids against the new order of things, as it yields the main point on which the triumphal acquittal of Orestes

depends. The reconciliation of the old and the new in the person of Hypermnestra is like the reconciliation of the Eumenides. Instead of being conservative, Aischylos, according to Mr. Ridgeway's conception, was in the forefront of his time and this explains the charge of ἀσέβεια. The endogamous theory is far more in accordance with what we know of ancient civilization than the more sentimental view that the 'Ixérides' is a plea for love in marriage instead of the legalized rape that marriage is so often even to-day, a crime which Guy de Maupassant depicts with such terrible vividness in 'Une Vie'.

This is an inadequate summary, but I trust not an unsympathetic one. Without sympathy no justice. Some years ago I gave what a French reviewer was pleased to call an ironical account of Terret's *Homère* (A. J. P. XX 87-90), but such has been the progress of unitarianism of recent days that the irony, if irony there be, has lost its edge; and if I do not surrender to Mr. Ridgeway, it is because some of my favorite fancies have been dispelled by a return to the authority of books, and anthropology cannot hope in the long run to oust Aristotle.

BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE.

ARTURO FARINELLI, *Dante e la Francia dall' età media al secolo di Voltaire*, 2 vols, I, pp. xxvi; 560; II, 381. Ulrico Hoepli, Milano, 1908.

Thirty years ago (1881) Scartazzini in his *Dante in Germania* noted a few scattered allusions to the life and works of Dante in German literature. Several studies have appeared since that time, treating of the influence of the greatest of Italian poets on various European literatures. Of these the most important is Farinelli's *Dante e la Francia*, which has among its many merits that of showing the utter worthlessness on almost every point of Oelsner's work on the same subject, covering the same period, which closes with the end of the eighteenth century. The work of Farinelli, both on account of the rare industry displayed, and the method of treatment, is one of the most remarkable contributions ever made to comparative literature. The contents of the book more than justifies its general title. The author has not only traced the influence of Dante on French writers, but also the Italian poet's indebtedness to the highly developed literatures of Northern and Southern France which were such sources of inspiration and material to nascent Italian literature. In this connection Farinelli has reviewed the evidence for Dante's sojourn at Paris, to show that however old the tradition, and

however much accepted by scholars down to the present day, it is only a literary invention, which should not be credited. He has shown that the poet's severe judgements on French history gained for him the ill-repute of a political partisan, instead of the reputation of an immortal seer in the writings of the champions of the French monarchy, in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

Farinelli has not confined his work to a search for direct literary influence in the works in prose and verse of the greatest of modern literatures, of which he gives a critical survey for over a period of five centuries. In the biographies of its authors he has sought for every token of an interest in things Italian, in their travels, the books they read, their associates; no source of information has been forgotten. He has not failed to note the copies in manuscript, or in printed edition of any of the works of Dante, which found their way into the libraries of royal or noble patrons of literature. He has made due comment on the rendering of passages of Dante, cited in a few of the many Italian works, translated into French, a slight indication of the part played by Italy in the development of French civilization. And the far-reaching literary influence, which commenced with the early imitators of Petrarch is drawn in broad lines, making all the more emphatic the fact that just in that period, Dante, to all but the very few, was a literary lay-figure, who could furnish a tag-end of a verse, be the hero of a silly tale, or an authority to be cited by political and religious pamphleteers. Farinelli touches on the commercial relations between the two countries which, among other results, led to the creation of the important Italian community at Lyons, whose printing-presses turned out the forgeries of the Aldine Dante, and the edition of the *Commedia* of de Tournes. In all this mass of detail, set forth in the style of a skilled *littérateur* and not of a painstaking pedant, one can only point out a very few additions and corrections, that should be made.

Writing in 1908 the author should not have referred to an imaginary author Chrétien Légouais (I, 8, n. 1) who, Thomas showed fifteen years ago, was due to a misreading of Chrétien de Troyes (*Rom.* XXII, 271). K. Hoffman as early as 1870 printed the passage of the manuscript of the prose *Lancelot* to illustrate the allusion to the cough of the dame de Malehaut (*Sitzungsb. d. Münch. Ak.* 1870, II, 48 ff.) as was noted by G. Paris in 1881 (*Rom.* X, 483). It is to be noted (24) that a translation of four verses of the *Roman de la Rose* is attributed to Dante as an original effort in an Italian popular tale on the poet (R. Köhler, *Gött. gel. Anzeigen*, 1869, 765). *Il Re giovane* was not Henry II (31) but his oldest son Prince Henry, who did not live to be king. That Bartholomew, the author of the *De proprietatibus rerum* was not English (108, 4) was pointed out by Delisle (*Hist. litt. de la France*, XXX, 353 ff.), who also noted that copies of the work were found in Italy in the latter part of

the twelfth century, and showed its relation to the *Proprietates rerum moralizate*, a work composed in Italy between 1281 and 1291 (363, 345 ff.).

For the story of the apparition of "Silo" appearing to one of his pupils, of which Farinelli only knows a Spanish version (113, n), it is only necessary to refer to a note in Crane's *Exempla* of Jacques de Vitry (145-6), and the identification of the protagonist of the story with the historical Serlo by Schwob (*Comptes Rendus de l'Acad. d. Inscriptions*, 1898, 508). The epitaph of Dietzmann, ascribed to Dante (123, n.) has been reprinted and fully discussed by C. E. Norton (Twentieth Annual Report of the Cambridge Dante Society, 3 ff.). It is certainly worth noting (141) that the library of the deposed last Pope of Avignon, Benedict XIII, who died in 1424 in his retreat at Peniscola in Catalonia, not only contained a copy of the *Commedia* and some of the Latin works, but also the commentary of Benvenuto, and a Latin translation of the *Commedia* (M. Faucon, *La librairie des papes d'Avignon*, I, 59-61, 85, n.; II, 140, 151). There is no authority for the statement that Chaucer went to Rome on his Italian journeys (144). The most interesting French translation of those sad lines which Dante puts into the mouth of Francesca da Rimini (165, 342) is that found on the wall of a dungeon of the Chateau de Loches in Touraine. With other inscriptions undoubtedly due to Ludovico Sforza, who spent his last years of captivity and died there (*Chronique de Louis XII par Jean d'Andon*, ed. R. de Maulde la Clavière, I, 280, n.), is found written in Gothic characters the couplet:

"Il n'y a au monde plus grande detstresse,
Du bon tempts soy souvenir en la tristesse",
—(Watts-Jones, *English Illustrated Magazine*, VIII, 390).

One can scarcely expect to find any imitation of Dante in a close translation (278-280) of the vision of Charles the Fat (not Bald), which appears for the first time in the *Chronicon Gentulense* of Hariulf (D'Achery, *Spicelgium* II, 322 ff.), who ended his work with 1088 (Ib. 356), but of which the best text is probably to be found in William of Malmesbury's *Gesta regum Anglorum* (ed. Stubbs, I, 112 ff.; cf. xxi, 1, xlii, n. 10; II, xxvii), written fifty years later.

Villey (*Les sources et l'évolution des Essais de Montaigne*, I, 112, 234) has made a certainty Farinelli's suggestion (505, n. 3) that Montaigne's citation (II, 12) of Purg, XXVI, 34 was taken from Varchi's *Ercolano*, and has also noted (112, 140) that the source of his only other Dante citation was Guazzo's *La civil conversazione*.

Only one phase of his subject has not appealed to the author; the role Dante was made to play as an Anti-papist champion by the Huguenot writers. Perhaps for this reason his interest has not been great enough to trace down the sources of the allusions of

Duplessis-Mornay in his *Mysterium iniquitatis* to Dante and other Italian writers (518; II, 338) to that armory of Protestant controversial writers, the work of J. Wolf printed at Lavingen in 1600, *Lectionum memorabilium et reconditarum centarii XVI* (I, 610 ff.; II, 683-4). Farinelli has given an analysis of the very rare Huguenot pamphlet, the *Avviso* of Perrot, and noted traces of its use; he has given more credit than was due, as a source of information, to the chronicle of Volterrano; he should have done more than mention the *Catalogus testium veritatis* of Mathias Flaccius, which went through several editions, and was the source of some allusions in French writers (e. g. 509). The Breton song, *Ann Infern in de la Villemarqué's Barzaz-Breiz* (II, 98, n.), might be inspired by the *Inferno*, but in the nineteenth and not in the fifteenth century. To attribute to a greater religious faith the more serious interest and profound study of Dante in France and Germany in the nineteenth century (II, 253), is to credit to one cause the resultant forces of a number of great movements. It would not be so surprising as it seems that "I'irlandese Sherlock" is cited as an authority by Le Prevost d'Exmes in his *Vie de Dante* (II, 300, n. 2), and by Farinelli himself (225), if the latter had noted that the work referred to, was in French, *Lettres d'un voyageur anglois*, printed at Geneva in 1779.

With these few comments one can recommend this work as worthy of its subject, a credit to the industry, erudition and literary skill of its author, with whose good critical sense one agrees at every page. It is fittingly dedicated to the memory of Gaston Paris, who living, would surely have commended a work so preeminent for qualities, which made the causeries, lectures and published studies of the great master of Romance scholarship such a source of inspiration to those who have sat under him.

GEORGE L. HAMILTON.

The Golden Latin Gospels in the Library of J. Pierpont Morgan, edited by H. C. Hoskier: New York, 1910. Two hundred copies privately printed by FREDERIC FAIRCHILD SHERMAN for J. Pierpont Morgan. Pp. CXVI + 363 and four full-page facsimiles.

The elegant printing, finest Italian hand-made paper, and simple but elegant binding mark this work as a book-lovers' prize, of which the fortunate recipients of Mr. Morgan's gift are justly proud.

The contents of the book from the scholar's point of view are no less remarkable. The editor's division of his work into

preface, introduction, preliminary remarks and collation. seems at first sight rather awkward and to lead to division of cognate subjects, if not to repetition, but excellent indices obviate any difficulty in the use.

The manuscript was formerly known as the Hamilton Gospels and is probably the most famous Latin Biblical MS in America, yet it is now edited for the first time. It will hereafter be designated by the sign \mathcal{P} . It is mainly a MS of the Vulgate and was written in England about the year 700 in gold letters on purple or blue vellum. As in many of the older Irish-English MSS the Vulgate text seems to have been imposed upon a good Old Latin base, which still remains in many readings scattered through all the Gospels. These readings and the discussion of them by the editor make the book most important in the study of the text of the Gospels. The Old Latin readings of \mathcal{P} are parallel to or even antedate the best of the Old Latin MSS, and often find their nearest relatives in the Greek, Old Syriac, or Coptic.

Mr. Hoskier has studied in detail the similarities of \mathcal{P} with all of these MSS and versions, and with the help of certain Greek cursive MSS, which show decided Latinisms, etc., tries to arrive at a consistent explanation of the cause of such frequent corruption in the early Biblical texts. Dr. Rendel Harris had first suggested, in a study of Codex Bezae, that many of its peculiarities were due to Latin influence and Chase followed referring everything to Syriac. Hoskier builds on both, but combining and correcting, even to the extent that Coptic influence is admitted as of almost equal rank. The method, by which these influences were disseminated, is held to have been the use of polyglot Bibles, having two, three, or four languages in parallel columns.

It is perhaps sufficient to presuppose bilingual MSS like Codex Bezae, and these may well have existed in Greek-Syriac or Greek-Coptic, as well as in Greek-Latin. While the theory is not yet proved, Mr. Hoskier has given us a notable collection of readings illustrating it, and more will be found. In fact the very early Greek MS of the Gospels in the Freer Collection, which I am now studying gives decided evidence. Many Syriacisms of the Ferrar Group, thought to be late in origin by Dr. Harris, are here found in identical form, and the Latinisms noted by Mr. Hoskier also occur. Of a long list of these, which he notes as unique or nearly so in Greek Cursive 243, seven are found in the Gospel's MS of the Freer Collection.

Perhaps of most immediate interest to Biblical scholars is the evidence the editor collects to show that the Sinaitic and Vatican MSS (\aleph , B) are not free from these corruptions.

Among the many peculiarities of \mathcal{P} we may note the following: the work of writing seems to have been divided among about forty scribes, i. e., a whole monastery; the last 28 pages of Matthew, because of older writing and finer parchment, are

thought by the editor to have belonged to an earlier volume; the Eusebian canons (incomplete) and the section numbers in the margin, and the characteristic Anglo-Saxon forms of letters and absence of ornamentation may also be noted.

The collation is made with the Clementine Vulgate of 1592, with the addition of Vulgate and Old Latin authorities as far as they are accessible, as well as the evidence of the Fathers. Greek, Syriac, and Coptic evidence is also quoted when in point.

An appendix contains a description and collation of a Latin fragment of the Gospels in the Morgan library. It consists of 18 leaves of the 7-8 century and exhibits an Old Latin text, sparingly revised on Jerome.

HENRY A. SANDERS.

New Edition of the Codex Veronensis (*b*).

E. S. Buchanan, who in *Old Latin Biblical Texts*, No. V, gave us a new edition of the Latin Gospel MS ff., with *h* of Acts and Apoc., has recently published in *O. L. B. Texts*, No. VI, a fresh edition of the important Latin Gospel Codex *b*.

This is a great step forward, for besides correcting some of Bianchini's errors, he shows us that Bianchini's line division of the MS was arbitrary and not truthful, which no one could possibly judge from the manner of printing the older edition.

Mr. Buchanan's wish was to re-edit Codex *a* first, but this has not been possible so far. The MS has been removed from Vercelli to Rome as it was in bad preservation, and has there (as I learn recently) been undergoing a "saving" process, and very likely the Benedictine Order may give us a new and better edition. I am quite sure that they can do for *a* what Mr. Buchanan has done for *b* and recover a good many first hand readings lost to us in Bianchini. Mr. Buchanan has recovered about 50 readings in St. Luke where Bianchini had merely printed without comment the readings of ancient second hands.

By far the most important of these passages is Luke xxiii. 34, where we have always been led to believe that *b* left out the first word from the cross, "*Father forgive them for they know not what they do*". A very few MSS have this omission. We can now remove *b** from the list in this great passage, witnessed to by Irenaeus, Origen, Hippolytus and a torrent of Fathers. What happened in *b* was this. The first hand omitted *dividentes etiam vestimenta ejus miserunt sortem*, but had clearly written:

Ihs autem dicebat pater dimitte illis nesciunt quid faciant.

In order to repair the omission of the second clause the *second hand* of *b* calmly effaced the whole of the first clause. "*But*

Jesus said Father forgive them . . .", and wrote IN ITS PLACE the second clause!

Mr. Buchanan has rendered a great service in pointing this out.

Of the rest of the first hand readings recovered, some are confirmed by ff, which agrees; a few are personal touches of *b*, as at Luke xvi. 24: "O pater", for "pater" of the prodigal son's apostrophe, which *b* is not averse to do elsewhere. Some are Syriac as at Luke ix. 23 and ix. 47 against the Greek. Another is bold and interesting: St. Luke xi. 4 in the Lord's prayer *b** had said "*libera nos ab inimico*", which *b*** has revised to *malo*.

The space at our command will not permit of further detailed examination. We commend the new issue of *b* to American students. It is well known that the *b-q* text is important. In fact it lay upon Irenaeus' desk; just as *a* upon St. Jerome's table; *gigas*, and *h* (Gospels) on that of Lucifer; *dimma* on that of Philaster; *e k* in the hands of Cyprian, Arnobius and Optatus; *f* in Ulphilas and Tatian's library: and *moling* in the company of St. Augustine; and just as *c* was known to Auct. op. imp., Auct. de prom. Auct. quaest. Cyril and Tertullian. We are taking more interest in textual criticism in these days, and what may not American scholars accomplish if, properly equipped, they lend their aid in unravelling the interesting questions which arise in connection with the great Graeco-Syriac-Latin base of all these manuscripts. *Fiat.*

H. C. HOSKIER.

SOUTH ORANGE, NEW JERSEY.

REPORTS.

ARCHIV FÜR LATEINISCHE LEXIKOGRAPHIE UND GRAMMATIK,
Vol. XV (dedicated to Professor Bücheler on the completion
of his fiftieth year as Doctor of Philosophy). Second Part.

297-351. Guil. Konjetzny, *De idiotismis syntacticis in titulis latinis urbanis* (C. I. L. Vol. VI) conspicuis. Examples of peculiarities in number; of confusion in gender, with additions to the collections of Diehl; of confusion in the use of cases; of the gen. abs.; of the extended use of the gen. with adjectives and with verbs; of the subjunctive for the indicative, and vice versa; and of other syntactical peculiarities.

351-352. O. Hey, *Zu den Gerundivkonstruktionen* (cf. ALL. XV. 56 ff.) Examples of the use mentioned on pp. 56 ff. from Pliny's Letters to Trajan, where P. desires approval of action which he has already taken, and where the form is evidently used for politeness or from modesty.

353-360. L. Havet, *Das Verbum eluare* "sich zu Grunde richten". Two verbs, *lavēre*, active, and *lavare*, intransitive, are clearly distinguished in early Latin, but were confused by the scribes. The perfect of both was *lāvi*, which is not parallel to *vēni* in the case of the transitive verb, but was due to confusion with *lāvi* = *lavavi*. *Elavare*, "be ruined" occurs six times in Plautus, for whom a perf. *eluavi* and an inf. *eluere* are assumed. *Eluam*, -as, -at should be emended to *eluem*, -es, -et. There was no confusion with *helluo*(*eluo*).

361-382. M. Pokrowskij, *Zur lateinischen Stammbildungslehre*. Further instances of combination and confusion of suffixes (see ALL. XIII. 460 ff.; AJP. XXXI. 229). 1. *Proletarius* — *proletaneus*, and confusion of -*ali*-, -*ario*- and -*aneo*- (-*ano*-). Would derive the word from **proletus*, "provided with descendants". Further examples of the same confusion are *extrarius*, *extraneus*; *pedarius*, *pedaneus*; *temporarius*, *temporaneus*; etc. 2. Confusion of -*bili*- and -*li*-. *Exitialis*, *exitiabilis*, etc. These were confused in the MSS and both forms passed into the Romance languages. 3. -*ia*-, -*ie*-, and -*io*-. This confusion is apparently Indo-Germanic. Doublets in -*ia* and -*ies* are common in Latin: *seria*, *series*; *luxuria*, *luxuries*; *facies*, **facia*, to be inferred from the Romance. Abstract nouns in -*ia* were formed from the fem. of adjectives, and the change of the fem. sing. to the neut. plur. was an early one in the vulgar speech. Finally all three forms were confounded, and we have such forms as

iustitium, fallacium, etc. 4. Suffix combination and the suffixes -mon-ia-, -mon-io-. These originated in nomina actionis in -mōn. Then an independent suffix -mōnio- (-a-) was formed, when these nomina agentis in -mōn had for the most part disappeared. This took place in the prehistoric period; Plautus has mercimonia and falsimonia. 5. On the late-Latin change of verbs of the third conjugation to the first. The examples from the glosses must be carefully scrutinized, since they are often due to error or to misunderstanding.

382. C. Weyman, Manere = esse. Not uncommon in the poets; see Sil. Ital. XII. 116, Paul. Nol. Carm. XI. 8f., and Sedulius. It finally appears in prose.

383-390. E. Wölfflin, Aus dem Latein des Vergilerklärers Donat. Tiberius Claudius Donatus (ed. Georgii; see ALL. XV. 253) was a professor of rhetoric and wrote with care, hence he is a reliable source for the Latin of the fifth or sixth century. Although he has many characteristics of vulgar Latin, they may well be derived from literary, especially juristic, sources. He shows the influence of Sallust and perhaps of Ennius. The frequently recurring ecce is a mannerism of the lecture-room.

391-399. R. v. Planta, Ein rätöromanisches Sprachdenkmal aus dem zwölften Jahrhundert. The text of fourteen lines of a discourse of Augustine with an interlinear translation in Rhaetoromanic, from cod. Einsied. 199, p. 452, followed by critical notes, a translation into German, and a commentary.

400. A. Zimmermann, Noch einmal die Etymologie von secus (ALL. IV. 602 and XI. 585; AJP. XXX. 98). Additional arguments for regarding this word as from *secu(n)s, a by-form of sequens. The u must be long in the adj.; in the adv. it was shortened by the Iambic Law, the working of which was most common in early times in the case of isolated particles.

401-407. A. Klotz, Klassizismus und Archaismus. Stilistisches zu Statius. An attempt to show that the classicism of the first century naturally led to the archaistic tendencies of the second; that is, it was a further step in the same direction. Both were due to an effort to avoid the colloquial language. This is illustrated by a study of the archaisms in Statius.

418-428. Miscellen. A. Klotz, Ultuisse. Zu Alcimus Avitus. In Epist. 72 Peiper (p. 90, 7) reads ultum isse; it should rather be ultuisse, a form analogous to the infin. in -uiri, and required by the metre. Other notes on Avitus, based on rhythmic grounds, corrections of cod. L, where the order is frequently inverted.

A. Zimmermann, Noch einmal donec. (Cf. ALL. V. 567 ff. and XI. 584 f.; AJP. XVIII. 379 and XXX. 98). From donique, a contamination of *doque and *done, from the prep. and adv.

*do; cf. quandonique, a contamination of quandoque and quandone, found in an inscription.

R. Meister, *Zu Coripp. laud. Iust. IV. 354*. Corrections of the ed. of Patsch, in *Monum. Germ. auct. antiq.*, III. 2, Berlin, 1879.

H. Jacobsohn, *Mytilius*. That this, and not *Mytilus*, is the correct form in ch. 25 of the *prologi hist. Philipp. of Pompeius Trogus*, is argued from the inscription on a coin of southern Illyricum.

H. Jacobsohn, *Brutes*. An example from an inscription, not entered in the *Thes. L. L.*

H. Jacobsohn, *Contumelia*. The word is not synonymous with *contumacia*. J. would connect it not with *tumeo*, but with *temerare*, *intemeratus*.

P. Germann, *Die sogenannten Varronischen Sentenzen*. (Preliminary communication). This collection should bear the name, not of Varro, but of Seneca, and its origin should be sought mainly in the *Epist.* From the variants of the MSS, *ad Paxianum*, *ad Papirianum* (cod. in *Trin. Coll.*, Dublin), etc., G. would reconstruct *ad Papinium* (*Fabianum*), a teacher of Seneca. He announces a forthcoming study of the sources of the collection.

R. Samter, *Quinquevir*. In *Hor. Sat. 2. 5. 56* would regard *scriba* as the writer of the will, and would interpret *recoctus ex quinqueviro* as meaning that the writer was chosen from among the five witnesses required by law.

429-441. Review of the Literature for 1906. 1907.

442. Necrology. Pater Odilo Rottmanner, by Wölfflin.

443-467. O. Hey, *Wortgeschichtliche Beobachtungen*. I. Die Phrase *Ut ita dicam*. The use of the perf., which occurs first in Quint., was due to regarding the verb as independent, and the mood as potential. The phrase regularly precedes the qualified statement. Its use with relation to similar expressions, *tamquam*, *quasi*, etc., is examined. It is a characteristic of style, occurring most frequently in Cic., but often in Sen. and Quint. It is avoided by Caesar, and by the historians generally, and it is not found in poetry. 2. Zum Gebrauch von *ut ita dicam* bei Cicero. He uses it less frequently to apologize for the use of a new word than for an unusual use of a word, a bold metaphor or figure of speech, or the transfer of words to a higher sphere of meaning than their ordinary one.

467. O. Hey, *Zur Assimilation von ct* (cf. *ALL. XV. 275-6*). An additional example (*coatores*) from inscriptions of the first or second century (*CIL. V. 4504* and *4505*).

468. N. Vulić, *Redire, reverti, reducem esse*. Since such expressions may be used of a return to a native country which one has never seen (*Verg. Aen. III. 94 ff.*), it is not necessary in

Spart. vit. Hadr. i. 3, *Natus est Romae . . . ad patriam redit*, to substitute *Italicae* for *Romae*.

469-472. Th. Bögel, *Ein Fall seltener Tmesis*. *Verecundus*, 2. 5 (in cant. deut.) has pseudo quoque *christianos impulsat*, to emphasize pseudo, and to avoid the postponement of quoque to so long a word. *V.* also has a tendency to separate the attribute and its noun. Further examples of such cases of tmesis are given, with reference to A. Souter, *A Study of Ambrosiaster*, Lond. 1905.

473-483. S. Brassloff, *Ueber den Gebrauch von proinde und perinde bei den klassischen Juristen*. *Proinde* is usually a deductive particle; the adverbial use (with and without *ac*, etc.) is rarer. *Perinde* as a deductive particle occurs but once (in Ulpian), while the adverbial use is regular. A number of apparently exceptional cases are examined, some of which are corrupt, while others seem to show the influence of the Justinian period.

483. P. Rasi, *Manere = esse*. An additional example from *Carm. ad Flavium Felicem de resurrectione mortuorum* (*Corp. Scr. Ecc. Lat. III. 3. App.*, p. 310, line 45).

484. A. Klotz, *Incessare*. This form is doubtful in Statius, but its existence is attested by the grammarian Eutyches (cf. *ALL. XV. 377*).

485-525. A. Klotz, *Die Statiusscholien*. The first commentary on *S.* was written about 400, and soon after that date Sulpicius Severus read his Statius with a commentary. These comments were used by Lactantius Placidius about the middle of the sixth century in his work on *S.*, a work which was in circulation until the Carolingian era. A separate collection of the scholia was made in Monac. 19482 and Paris. 8063 and 8064. We thus have left of Lact. Plac. only the *de Statio*, but his characteristics as revealed by this work are in harmony with the Gallic literature of the sixth century.

525. L. Havet, *Armatus, Bewaffnung*. The *Thes. L. L.* has no example from *Cic*; but see *Caec. 61*.

526. P. Rasi, *Vömi Perfektform von vomere?* This form is cited from Fronto by Forcellini-DeVit. *R.* would read it in *Carm. de Pascha* (v. 52, Hartel).

527-547. K. E. Götz, *Waren die Römer blaublind?* A continuation of the article in *ALL. XIV. 75 ff.* (*AJP. XXXI. 345*). An examination of other words than *caeruleus*, with the same result, namely, a negative answer to the question.

548. W. Heraeus, *Obrio und obro*. Examples from late Latin of forms derived from these presents indicative.

548. W. Heraeus, *Glando*. Examples and possible examples of this by-form of *glans*, additional to the three cited by Georges.

549-559. W. Heraeus, *Zur sog. Peregrinatio Silviae*. Critical and linguistic notes. H. finds that the acc. for the nom. does occur.

559. W. Heraeus, *Crep(a)tura*. The reading of the editions in Schol. Juv. 3. 190 is *crepaturas*, of the MSS, *crepturas*. CGL. III. 313. 15 has *creptura*, as well as Anton. Placent. in Itin. Hierosol., p. 172. 5 Geyer. The Romance languages, however, point to *crepatura*.

559. W. Heraeus, *Uter, utris*. Juvenius, II. 373. and 375 has *utribus*, and although he is not trustworthy in metrical matters, this quantity is supported by the evidence of the Romance languages. Additional examples of the nom. form *uter* are given. Ps. Acr. in Hor. Sat. 2. 5. 98 has *utris*.

560-564. W. Heraeus, *Der Accusativus nach memor, nescius, u. ä.* A collection of examples of this construction.

564. W. Heraeus, *Lacernobirrus*. Would read this compound in Acta S. Cypr. ch. 5.

565-574. E. Wölfflin, *Zu den lateinischen Spruchversen*. The relation of Publilius Syrus to Menander and Euripides is examined. The proverbs are more independent in the former, not being connected with the preceding context by particles. It is difficult to establish a connection between Seneca de Moribus and Publilius. His relation to Caecilius de nugis philosophorum is discussed, with critical notes on Caecilius.

574. C. Weyman, *Epikerfragment bei Seneca?* In the *De tranq. animi*, 4. 5, *stat tamen et clamore iuvat* is the first part of an hexameter, perhaps from Rabirius (cf. *De benef.* 6. 3. 1).

575-578. Miscellen. W. Heraeus, *Congustus*. Examples of this word.

M. Pokrowskij, *Spätlateinisches*. Notes on Götz, *Thes. Gloss. emendatarum*.

C. Weyman, *Evalere*. Not in Georges, but occurs in Vincentius of Lerinum, *commonit.*, ch. 5 (p. 6. 25 d, Jülicher, 1905; p. 16. 13 d, Rauschen, Bonn, 1906; *Florileg. patr. fasc. V*).

C. Weyman, *Cumque = quandocumque*. *Cumque* in Hor. *Carm.* 1. 32. 15 is usually emended, but an example of *cumque = quandocumque* is found in the inscription of Honorius I on the Basilica Vaticana (cf. De Rossi, *Inscr. Chr. Urb. R.* II. 1, p. 145, et al).

579-598. Review of the Literature for 1907. 1908.

599-602. Necrology. Fr. Bücheler, by Fr. Vollmer.

602. Editorial Note, announcing the discontinuance of the publication of the ALL.

A supplement to vol. XV contains the following :

Pp. 1-6. O. Hey, Necrology: Eduard von Wölfflin, with a portrait.

7-26. O. Probst, Index to vols. XI-XV.

JOHN C. ROLFE.

REVUE DE PHILOGIE, XXXII (1908), 3 and 4.

Pp. 175-180. Charles Joret, Villosion's Greek Palaeography. In spite of Villosion's repeatedly announced intention of writing a work on Greek palaeography, and in spite of his friend Chardon de la Rochette's positive statement to the effect that Villosion did actually write such a work, it is clear from a letter of Bast to Wytttenbach that Villosion did not carry out his intention but delegated the task to Bast, who, however, failed to execute it.

Pp. 181-192. Louis Havet, Notes on Plautus. (Continuation. See A. J. P. XXXI, p. 470.) Men. 152. 300. 379-80. 399. 418. 431. 446. 667. 681. 740. 778. 796. 808. 828 (and Capt. 595). 1013 (and Rud. 656). 1069. 1091. 1112. 1144. 1160-1161. (To be continued.)

Pp. 192-193. Henri Grégoire, *κέλμις ἐν σιδήρῳ*. Following up the clue afforded by Roussel's interpretation (cf. R. de Ph. XXIX, 293-295) of the Kelmis myth in *Paroemiographi Graeci* I, p. 106, 9 ff., Grégoire emends *κέλμις* . . . *ὑπὸ τῶν ἀδελφῶν εὐμενῶς ἐν τῇ ἰδῇ* so as to read *κέλμις* . . . *ὑπὸ τῶν ἀδελφῶν <πε> φονευμένος <ἐτάφη> ἐν τῇ ἰδῇ*.

Pp. 194-209. Victor Mortet, Remarks on the Language of Vitruvius. After a brief review of the previous literature on the subject and some general remarks on Vitruvian usage, Mortet treats the following topics: Vitruvius and the language of the agrimensores; abstract substantives; technical terms; degrees of comparison; numerical expressions of measure; various verbs; passive forms; infinitive for the gerund; *erit ut* for the simple future. (To be continued.)

Pp. 210-214. René Pichon, The Probable Epoch of Quintus Curtius. The precise epoch of Curtius is doubtful. The dates of the various estimates range from the time of Augustus to that of Theodosius. Pichon, who already in a previous article (cf. A. J. P. XXIX, 360 sq.) had expressed himself in favor of a late date, inclines to the view that places Curtius in the fourth century of our era. He not only shows that no valid evidence has as yet been adduced against this hypothesis, but he also presents two weighty arguments in favor of it. The first of these arguments is based upon statements in the tenth book, which make it

appear that Curtius holds political views that correspond with those of Lactantius and the panegyrists of Constantius and Constantine. The second argument rests upon the fact that, leaving out of consideration Florus, who is really a rhetorician, Curtius is the first real historian to employ metrical prose. This invasion of the rhythmical clausula into the domain of history, argues Pichon, is much more likely to have taken place in the fourth century, in which metrical prose found its way even into letters, than at an earlier date.

Pp. 215-225. J. Lesquier, Note on an Inscription from Ashmounêin. Lesquier provides a new edition, with critical notes, of a Greek dedicatory inscription that was found at Hermoupolis Magna (Ashmounêin), and was published by Lefebvre in *Bulletin de la Société archéologique d'Alexandrie*, 1908, No. 10. The inscription is written in three columns, and contains names of officers and privates of the garrison of Hermoupolis. In the discussion that follows the text and notes, Lesquier shows that the tactical units commanded by the eponymous officers of columns II and III of our inscription were intermediate in size between a hecatontarchy and a chiliarchy, and were probably called *συντάγματα* in the third century B. C. and possibly *ἡγεμονίαι* in the second. The officers perhaps bore simply the name of *ἡγεμόνες*. Column I contains evidence of the existence of eponymous officers that commanded larger units than the chiliarchy.

P. 226. F. Cumont, Vettius Valens, VII, Prooemium. Comparing Vett. Val. p. 293, 26 (Kroll), Cumont corrects τῶν τε λοιπῶν ἀστέρων, p. 263, 20, so as to read τῶν τε ἑ λοιπῶν ἀστέρων.

Pp. 227-246. Book Notices.

Pp. 247-277. C.-E. Ruelle, *Hermes Trismegistus, The Sacred Book on the Decans*. The So-called Sacred Book of Hermes addressed to Asclepius (Τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ πρὸς Ἀσκληπιὸν ἢ λεγομένη ἱερὰ βιβλος) contains a detailed treatment of the thirty-six decans. In each case the special name of the decan is followed by a description of his pictorial representation, a statement of the part or parts of the body presided over by him, directions for the preparation of an amulet that will serve to ward off the diseases of the parts specified, and instructions as to the kind of food from which to abstain so as not to make the charm ineffective. This interesting treatise, which was first published by Dom Pitra on the basis of an inferior Moscow MS belonging to the Holy Synod, is here re-edited by Ruelle upon the basis of the Parisinus, No. 2256, supplemented by the Parisinus, No. 2502, both of which MSS belong to the Bibliothèque nationale. An elaborate critical commentary is found at the bottom of the pages and a French translation, facing the Greek text, has also been supplied.

Pp. 278-290. Louis Havet, Notes on Plautus. (Continuation from pp. 181-192. See above.) Merc. 305. 496-497. 566-

570. 806. Mil. 24. 37 (also 830 and Amph. 431). 77. 221. 223. 240. 262. 427. 450-451. 483-484. 603. 606. 628-629. 645 (and Rud. 867). 650. 657 (and Symm., epist. 1, 29). 660. 693. 707. 720-721. 754. 762 and 777 a. 830 (see above). 848. 852. (To be continued.)

Pp. 291-299. J. Marouzeau, On the Use of -ST=EST. Besides being used by certain copyists as a convenient abbreviation in long verses, -st is preferred before a punctuation mark or before a metrical pause, whereas est is used as a rule after a pause, or when the verb *to be* precedes its predicate or is emphatically repeated. These rules do not, however, determine the practice of all the MSS or even of all the plays of any one MS. The *Trinummus*, for example, behaves in a peculiar manner in both families of MSS, and Marouzeau's observations thus serve to verify the conclusion reached by Leo in an entirely different manner, to wit, that the text of the *Trinummus* has had a history of its own.

Pp. 300-306. Georges Romain, On Certain Passages in the Letters of Cicero. Critical notes on Att. I, 14, 2-3. Fam. I, 9, 23. Att. V, 15, 3. 21, 1. 21, 12. VI, 2, 7. Fam. VIII, 16, 2. V, 21, 2. XVI, 21, 2.

Review of Reviews for 1907.

C. W. E. MILLER.

BRIEF MENTION.

When the White-Seymour series was set on foot, I partly promised a version of HUG's *Symposium*, but I soon rebelled against the whole scheme. Americans, I thought, had got beyond that stage (A. J. P. X 502, XVIII 122). It was high time to assert our independence. However, my version of HUG was made for my own edification and amusement—the same thing in my case—and it still lies side by side with my rendering of Kock's *Frogs* and other reams of translations and adaptations from the German. The memory of these things comes back to me with the appearance of SCHÖNE's revised edition of HUG (A. J. P. XXXI 367) and their burial service—is it not written in the General Epistle of Jude, 'Twice dead are they, plucked up by the roots'? HUG was a contemporary of mine at Bonn. I wonder what he would have thought of my marginal notes on his performance. I wonder still more what he would have thought of SCHÖNE's changes. If there are such things as ghosts, revisers deserve to be haunted. I never take up the Schneidewin-Nauck Sophokles without calling up the image of Schneidewin, whom I knew better personally than any of my German preceptors, and figuring to myself the scornful expression of that sensitive scholar's countenance. But all scholars are sensitive. We all wince at foreign revision. We are all apt to say as that stout Jesuit is reported to have said: 'Sint ut sunt aut non sint'. To be sure, SCHÖNE professes to have gone to work gingerly and to have made only such changes as HUG himself would have made if he were extant—and could see through SCHÖNE's eyes. Nay, more than that, SCHÖNE professes to have retained much of HUG with which he himself is not in accord, and he says that this holds especially of the Introduction. Now, I will not undertake to verify this assertion throughout, but some of the changes cannot fail to strike the eye even of the casual reader. So, for instance, HUG's long note on the priority of the two Symposia has disappeared, doubtless much to the indignation of HUG's shade, for HUG was a vehement advocate of the priority of Xenophon (see A. J. P. XXIII 455). In the important chapter on the date of the composition of the *Symposium*, SCHÖNE puts the 'pretended anachronism' of 193 A out of court and in his eyes the argument based on the διοικισμός of Mantinea 385, so far from being cogent, is a downright failure.¹ 'A work like the *Symposium* in which the difficult and compli-

¹ From which opinion Raeder, B. Ph. W., 4 Feb., 1911, Sp. 130, dissents emphatically.

cated form of the narrated dialogue is treated with the most delicate calculation and sovereign mastery cannot be the work of a beginner, but presupposes long practice in handling the literary form of the dialogue'. The *Symposium* is a narrated dialogue, and is classed with the *Theaetetus* and the *Parmenides* as one of the dialogues in which the narrator is not an eye-witness, but reports the matter at second hand.

Tears of compassion tremble on my eyelids
Ready to fall

on the watershed of the *Theaetetus* so triumphantly reared by Teichmüller. According to SCHÖNE, the *Symposium* is one of the later dialogues, and as a proof of Plato's advanced age he proceeds to adduce 219 A: *ἡ τοι τῆς διανοίας ὄψις ἀρχεται ὅξυ βλέπειν, ὅταν ἡ τῶν ὀμμάτων τῆς ἀκμῆς λήγειν ἐπιχειρῇ*. To which the shade of HUG might rejoin that the speaker is Sokrates, that Plato is a dramatist of the first rank and that he is not to be classed with the author of Pelham who always made his hero the same age as the writer happened to be at the time when each novel was written. HUG's long note on 'das momentane Gedankensystem des Philosophen Platon' is suppressed. The savage kick at Herr Krohn—Herr being a deadly insult in philological controversy—is withdrawn, and to make up for the loss of that bit of liveliness there is an addendum to HUG's characteristic of a gentleman whom I would fain call Herr Eryximachos. 'Er ist nicht sehr bedeutend und nicht interessant, hat aber einen gewissen trockenen Humor'. 'Dry humour' is a contradiction in terms, but corresponds somewhat to the Scottish 'pawkiness', a form of jocosity which is especially irritating in men who are 'neither important nor interesting'. Of course, I quite agree with SCHÖNE in his estimate of Eryximachos, whose name Teuffel has etymologized as the 'Belchfighter' (*Ἐρυξίμαχος* q. d. *ἐρευξίμαχος*), a name quite suited to his glorious victory over Aristophanes' hiccups, and quite suited to that other temperance advocate with whom I have elsewhere compared him, Sir Toby-Belchfighter Malvolio (A. J. P. XXX 109). But I have no desire to etymologize away the personality of Eryximachos, and in like spirit SCHÖNE refuses to join HUG in etymologizing away the personality of Diotima, refuses to be one of those who 'spy a great peard under her muffler'. The history of Greek proper names is an interesting chapter, and I have often wondered whether the unfortunate Diotimos of the *Anthology*, *Γαργαρίων παισὶν βῆτα καὶ ἄλφα λέγων*, was not a descendant of the seeress who taught Sokrates the secret of true love (Hellas and Hesperia, p. 14).

These specimens of the variations in the Introduction must serve. With the comparison of the two commentaries I dare

not trust myself, though the comparison would be a good class exercise such as I sometimes recommend to my students as illustrations of the progress of doctrine. Indeed, the old editions *cum notis variorum* may be made to yield many philological, many moral lessons. So much is deemed worthy of note that has passed over into the realm of 'cottidianae formae'. So many authorities are cited that have ceased to be authorities. So many interpretations are disputed that are not worth adducing. And all these three types are represented on the very first page of the HUG-SCHÖNE *Symposium*. The spelling *πρώην* is taken for granted. 'Judeich' has taken the place of 'Bursian', and the discussion of the pun in *Φαληρεύς* has disappeared together with HUG's wonderful hendecasyllabic verse. Further on Apollodoros loses the surname *μανικός* and the Bodleian *μαλακός* is restored with an elaborate justification (173 D). The prodigiously long note on the form of *oratio obliqua* in the *Symposium* is sent packing, but while the new editor evidently yawns over the screed about the 'perverted proverb', 'Αγάθων' ἐπὶ δαίτας ἱασιν αὐτόματοι ἀγαθοί, he finds himself obliged to retain it because he has nothing better to put in its place, and actually adds to it by quoting Adam's article in *Classical Review* X 238.

Another long note on the article with proper names 174 D is saved alive. It is not especially helpful, but the utterly needless discussion on *ἀπονίζειν* is reduced to three lines. 175 B SCHÖNE makes short work of *ἐπειδὴν τις ὑμῖν μὴ ἐφεστήκη*. Instead of trying to emend the passage, he gives it up as a *locus conclamatus*. At least no one has succeeded, he says, in restoring it, and the context yields no cogent conclusion as to the sense of the clause. 175 D HUG's *κενότερον* and *κενοτέραν* are brushed away without apology. BTW are more potent than Choroiboskos and the Herculaneum MSS and Dindorf, *Dem.* lv 27. I fancy that HUG would have held on to *κενότερον* as Kynaigeiros held on to the Persian boat. Oddly enough, rejected in SCHÖNE's text, *κενοτέραν* holds its own in the notes,—under the circumstances an unfortunate typographical error. So 175 E *πλέον ἢ τρισμυρίους*, *πλέον* is put back instead of the more recondite *πλείν* and the discussion of the capacity of various Greek theatres is ruthlessly cut out. How much more piety Mr. Pearson has shown in his edition of Headlam's *Agamemnon*, where for instance he has retained a long string of *παρὰ γνώμην*'s that are of no conceivable use except as evidence of Headlam's wide reading which nobody is disposed to deny, as nobody will deny Tafel's wide reading (*A. J. P.* XXXI 485).

But for the constituency of the AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY, for scholars who are no longer in the seminary stage, it

would be a sheer weariness, if I were to go through the book and show how unsparingly SCHÖNE's pruning-hook has been applied, and with one more illustration of the progress of doctrine I will pass on. The grotesque figure of the globular man-woman which rejoiced the eyes of the readers of the first edition of HUG (189 E) was suppressed in the second, but alas! in SCHÖNE's note the ball that rolled so merrily in the old commentary has been succeeded by a prosaic cylinder that crushes out all the joy of the passage. In short, the ideals of the two editors are different. SCHÖNE believes, as I do, in illuminating the text, HUG believed in enlightening the student. Theoretically, a classic is a ζῆλον, not a clothes-horse, on which to hang syntactical analyses or archaeological disquisitions. Theoretically, every needless word in a commentary is an impertinence, but practically no commentator schools himself to such renunciation. Who would give up Lobeck's Ajax or for that matter Peter Burmann's Petronius? We must deal gently with the memory of HUG and I rejoice that to my objurgations against his prolixities and drearinesses 'is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever', to come back to the General Epistle of Jude (A. J. P. XXXI 367).

Now no one will find fault with Mr. BURY, the first English editor of the *Symposium*, for being prolix. Even without the guidance of SCHÖNE he has kept bounds in his adaptations of HUG, to whose useful and scholarly edition he has frankly acknowledged his indebtedness. Of course, every editor is indebted to his predecessors, and while a blanket acknowledgment like Stahl's (A. J. P. XXIX 259) is not always satisfactory, still life is too short to trace every observation to its ultimate source. The late Professor Morgan used to amuse himself with genealogies of that sort in the commentators to Persius, but the 'non sua poma' are often apples of Sodom and not worth claiming (cf. A. J. P. IX 126). A judicious conveyance is a real service and Mr. BURY has earned a right to help himself to the stores of others by contributions of his own. A closer study of Mr. BURY's work has modified in his favour my original impression, and I am not going to indulge in the kind of criticism that speckles the pages of *Brief Mention*. Mr. BURY's Introduction is very elaborate, and to one who has tried to make something out of the *Symposium* for himself, it has a distinctly personal interest. Like Mr. BURY I have attempted to establish for myself the interrelation of the five speeches, and in January, 1887, I published a paper on the subject in the Johns Hopkins University Circular, No. 55, an abstract of a more elaborate essay which was to have appeared in the Journal. But the longer paper was crowded out by other and more important matters. Cf. A. J. P. XV 92. Other and more important matters will doubtless crowd it out to the end.

In these days of monographs, it was inevitable that the grammatical figure known as the poetical plural or the plural for the singular should be passed under the harrow. First the Latin usage was taken in hand by Maas in the *Archiv* for 1902 (A. J. P. XXX 342-3), and then the Greek, from which the Latin was largely derived, by KARL WITTE in his *Singular und Plural* (Teubner, 1907); then three years afterward by HORACE LEONARD JONES in *Cornell Studies* (Longmans and Green), *The Poetical Plural of Greek, studied in the light of Homeric Usage*. As so often happens in America, the material had been gathered and the results reached before the writer had come into possession of the foreigner's work. Similar instances of what might be called philological laches might be cited even when the *perant male* predecessors had published their conclusions, not in Germany, but in America. But after all, there is always an interesting difference in the angle of vision, and the student is not the loser for the lack of bibliographical vigilance. Now it is not my purpose in this *Brief Mention* to compare the two works, but simply to make some irresponsible remarks on the general subject. The underlying principles are simple enough, and, which is of no little importance, the phenomena may be brought to the test of consciousness in the vernacular, which yields abundant illustrations.

The plural for the singular rests ultimately on a shift of conception, then follows analogy, more or less close analogy, which is often prompted by metrical convenience, by that *metri causa* at whose door so many unfathered bantlings are laid. What is poetic in one language is prosaic in another, and numbers shift within the range of the same language. Mass, the category with which WITTE opens his study, is singular. The plural gives a variety of samples. 'Ashes' has a plural feel for us. So has 'oats'. Not so 'pearlash', 'potash', 'oatmeal'. The 'ash' of a cigar means something else than the 'ashes' of a cigar. 'Gold' and 'silver' have no plural, but 'irons' and 'coppers' are used in a special sense. When the Greek says αἵματα he means 'gouts of blood'; when we say with Shakespeare 'young bloods', we mean νεανίας, for which 'young bloods' is a better translation than 'prinxes' (A. J. P. XXXII 117). 'Water' gives one aspect, 'waters' another—either 'the waters that come down at Lodore' or mineral springs, for which the plural is invariably used. ὕδατα and πηγαί are both poetic in Greek. WITTE hesitates about δρυμά and inclines to Homeric analogy with δένδρεα. 'Into the woods my Master went', sings Lanier. It is not at all the same thing as 'the wood'. In the mouth of those who are not bound by grammar you can actually hear 'a woods'. 'Molasses' in certain parts of our country is a plural. During the Civil War it was a scarce article, and, as I have noted elsewhere, the plural might have been set down as a *pluralis maiest-*

tatis, and there are those who can bear witness to the curious extension of analogy to the once familiar and always dire substitute for molasses. The same people who said 'those molasses' said also 'those sorghum'. And so our vernacular can help us to understand those shifts of conception of which so much is made. WITTE'S next category has to do with parts of the body. In English symmetrical parts of the body pair off as in Greek, but we distinguish. 'Chest' is a unit, 'breast' is noncommittal, 'breasts' distinctly feminine. *στήνα* is analogous to *στήθη*, itself analogous to *μαστοί*. We do not analyze the back, as the Greek does occasionally in *νῶτα*, nor the 'midriff', as the Greek does in *φρένες*. In fact the 'midriff' has become even more of a book-word than 'diaphragm'. One seldom hears either word in conversation. Then there is the chapter of abstract nouns. 'Pluralizing abstracts makes them concrete' is a convenient way of putting the phenomenon in Greek and Latin, but what we call abstract was to the Greek a personification (A. J. P. XVII 366; XXXI 145)—'a father', or more frequently 'a mother'. The neuter is the fruit of an action. This may account for the more extended use of the distributive plural in Greek than in English. The plural for the singular of persons and personal belongings is largely 'affectations', mock modesty, sham evasion of responsibility, with the resultant *ἄγκος*. These are things of which so much is made in grammar, and which might well be treated under the head of rhetoric.

When these phenomena occur in poetry, the question of metrical convenience is to be considered. The Pindaric *ἡμέρον* = *ἡμέτερον* (P. 3, 27) may bid us pause and study the situation, but *ἡμέτερος* = *ἐμός* is often a mere metrical convenience (A. J. P. XX 459). And the same thing is notorious in Latin. Cicero's shiftings from *nos* to *ego* and *ego* to *nos* in his letters have prompted an inquiry into the fluctuations of that sensitive soul (A. J. P. XIX 234), but in the elegiac distich we dare not refine. It is a matter of spondaic words, in which Latin abounds, and of iambic words, of which there is no superfluity in Latin. Spondaic forms of *nos* = *ego* haunt the hexameter and crop up in the first half of the pentameter, but in the latter half there is no lack of *mihi*'s and the possessive of the first person singular. 'Sitque memor *nostri* necne, referte *mihi*', says Ovid; 'Et mala si qua tibi dixit dementia *nostra*, | Ignoscas: capiti sint precor illa *meo*', Tibullus. So it is always a fair guess whether the exceptional use of plural for singular or vice versa is due to poetical vision or metrical vise, and there is always opportunity for wrangling over details of interpretation.

Some very interesting facts of poetical usage come out from the exhaustive record of these variations and the grouping of the

phenomena may be manipulated so as to yield important results. So WITTE has made use of singular and plural for the stratification of Iliad and Odyssey. If all these stratifications only coincided throughout! (A. J. P. XXII 468). There are indexes to both treatises, WITTE's and JONES's, which will facilitate the use of them, and will doubtless serve to generate other monographs. Dr. JONES has made use of the term 'dualizing plural', which I myself have found convenient. Usener, it will be remembered, attributed the mystic significance of the number three to the inability of the primitive man to count beyond that number, in spite of the *πέντε* with which nature has provided him. 'Certain expressions in which 'three' means 'many' point back to a distant time when our ancestors had developed no conception of number beyond three' (A. J. P. XXV 97). If this is so, we may suppose that the plural began with two and paused before it struck out to the provisional limit of three. When that was reached, the dual was formed to distinguish 'bothness' from 'twoness'. The dualistic explanation fits many examples that are set down under other categories.

WITTE is, as we have just seen, a Separatist—one of those whose dissecting knives Mr. ALEXANDER SHEWAN has undertaken to blunt and to break in his book, *The Lay of Dolon, Homer Iliad K* (Macmillan). A determined Unitarian is Mr. SHEWAN, and he is proud of flaunting the banner reared by Col. Mure. True, it requires scant courage to be a Unitarian now-a-days. 'Einheitshirten' and 'Kleinliederjäger' are no longer terms of contempt. The two armies mingle, mingle, mingle as they mingle may, with the privilege of flying at each other's throats when a new quarrel is started. Brought up under separatist influences myself, I found many years ago that for me at least it was impossible to rouse popular interest in things of shreds and patches; and for an audience of non-Grecians I have always treated the Odyssey as a seamless robe. If I had been possessed of the genius of Professor Murray, I should have been more faithful to such convictions as I had, but once enlisted in the cause of the defence, I became immeshed in my own sophistries—as they were to begin with—and the pitiable results of a lack of faith are discernible in the summaries I have given from time to time of works on the Homeric Question, which still possesses for me a fatal fascination. But as I resisted the temptation to give a summary of Wilamowitz's tractate on Iliad Θ , in which he holds that Θ was composed in order to bring I and κ , then independent lays, into the Iliad, so I must resist the temptation to follow Mr. SHEWAN in his defence of the Doloneia, which even many Unitarians have abandoned to the tender mercies of the wicked dissectors. To one who has lived through a great

war, the *Doloneia* is one of the most interesting books in the *Iliad*. I never open it without thinking of Jeb Stuart's ride round the army of McClellan as it lay before Richmond, and I say to myself: A great war without a raid is unthinkable. Who would wish the *Doloneia* away? But Mr. SHEWAN goes much farther than that and in a series of chapters which deal incidentally with the canons and methods of Homeric Criticism, point after point is taken up and at the close of each chapter the verdict is given in favor of κ . The lay is an uncontaminated unit. The linguistic attack is repelled. The alleged difference between *Iliad* and *Odyssey* is scouted. Monro's formidable list loses its fierce aspect on nearer examination, and Mr. SHEWAN continues to treat the language of the two epics as one and the same. No wonder that he welcomes the accession of Professor Scott, who has effectually refuted the notion that the *Odyssey* shows a marked advance in the number of abstract nouns. The verbal peculiarities on the surface of κ are perhaps more numerous than in some parts of the *Iliad*, but the popularity of this detachable lay would have involved more copying and led to more copyist's errors. Odyssean connection is not to be inferred from prepositional usage, and the articular evidence does not prove κ to be late. There is no case against κ in the digamma. The charge of plagiarism is rebutted. Armor and dress described in κ do not contribute anything to the proof that the lay is not ancient. The question 'Is the *Doloneia* a burlesque?' is answered in the negative. κ stands and falls with the *Menis*. If κ is old and genuine, κ is not to be condemned as modern, spurious and Odyssean. The *Doloneia* appears to be as old as the original *Iliad*, or the original *Iliad* of the critics. But this summary which I have given as nearly as possible in the words of the writer must suffice for this number.

In a famous line of Kratinos, ὑπολεπτολόγος, γνωμοδιώκτης, Εὐριπιδαριστοφανίζων, 'A splitter of hairs, a monger of saws, a Euripidaristophanizer', the interpretation of Εὐριπιδαριστοφανίζων is open to controversy. But it seems fairly evident that it is intended to enhance the other two epithets and that Kratinos, the Aischylos of the Old Comedy, who had no patience with supersubtlety and only the average Greek fancy for sententious reflexion, is girding at his saucy young contemporary for his likeness to the very poet whom he is always mocking. Everybody knows the danger of habitual mockery. Pick out a butt and, as time goes on, a fatal assimilation takes place between the assailant and the assailed, and the enemy becomes one's next friend, one's self. But, not to discuss the resemblances, native and acquired, between the style of Euripides and the style of Aristophanes, Professor CARLO PASCAL's recent work on Aristophanes seems to favour another

interpretaion of the hybrid word. In his *Dioniso, Saggio sulla religione e la parodia religiosa in Aristofane* (Catania, Battiato) after a detailed study of Aristophanes' treatment of the divine personages and religious ceremonies that figure in his comedies, Professor PASCAL comes to the conclusion that Aristophanes was, as it were, a spiritual brother of Euripides. But if irreverence is the bond that unites the two poets, it is not a charge that could fairly be brought against Aristophanes by Kratinos, for who could have made freer than Kratinos in his *Némeis* with the august personage of Zeus and the fair form of the mother of Kastor and Polydeukes?

The irreverence of Aristophanes, like the irreverence of Euripides, is a familiar theme and Professor PASCAL's essay is plentifully garnished with literature. But it has its parallel and its explanation in what goes on to-day in Latin countries. Obdurate saints are held to an account for the failure to answer prayer and their images are chastised by the faithful. No Anglo-Saxon girl would pitch the statuette of St. Joseph out of window as happens in that charming story 'La Neuvaïne de Colette'. And not only the saints. I have before me as I write a proclamation of the alcalde of a South American town, in which that magnate gives the 'Supreme Creator' warning of all the dire proceedings that are to ensue if He continues to withhold rain beyond a certain date in order that said Supreme Creator 'may understand with whom He has to do'. But the very maltreatment, the very threats, involve faith, and that is the great difference between Aristophanes and Euripides. There is no question of the existence of the gods in Aristophanes. Euripides is skeptical. Euripides' acid is the acid that eats up the molten image. The acid of Aristophanes is a mild solution that merely stings and prickles, but does not destroy. Orthodoxy covered a multitude of sins then as it does now. Aristophanes was orthodox, Euripides was a rationalist, if one dare use so modern an expression. Religion being an affair of state, the Greeks were not exacting. *νομίζειν θεούς* is not a matter of conscientious ground of action, as Mr. Neil says in his note on the Equites, 515. That is one of those *obiter dicta* that are always bobbing up in commentaries. *νόμος* is convention. Accept the gods the state provides and all is well. The trouble with the Christians under the Roman Empire was that they were so absurdly uncompromising, that they followed the direction *μὴ συσχηματίζεσθε* so closely. No sensible Roman could understand their attitude. A pinch of incense, a kiss of the hand would answer? What reasonable human being would object to meats offered to idols? *ιερεία* after all is only butcher's meat. Those of us who are old enough to remember the days of what was called Bibliolatry can testify that it made a great difference whether Tom Paine took a liberty

with Scripture or a professed believer, prelate or presbyter. The ministers of the Word, owing to their familiarity with the text of Scripture, furnished more than their quota of what would have been profane in an infidel, and, as children, the sons of divines had to be specially cautioned against trivial use of the Bible. There is not much danger of that now. It was but the other day that I saw the phrase 'abomination of desolation' attributed to Voltaire. But are we really more reverent than our grandfathers?

According to Professor PASCAL, Aristophanes is usually set down as a fierce reactionary, an alarmist hater of anything like innovation (feroce retrivo, pavido odiatore di ogni novità). This is certainly what Deschanel says, who compares Aristophanes to Bossuet and calls him 'conservateur fébrile et réactionnaire enragé'. On the contrary, PASCAL thinks that his examination has proved Aristophanes to have been a man who shews freedom and independence of thought, freedom and independence in his attitude towards the problems of public life. In his art he avoids the well-worn paths and conventional forms. He inveighs against low comedy, though, to be sure, he makes use of the old machinery at times, albeit in a much more discreet and reserved fashion than his rivals (A. J. P. X 265 ff.). His determination to be original is shown by his Hermes, who is very different from the Hermes of tradition and has taken on some of the features of Herakles. But the main thing that Professor PASCAL emphasizes as the result of his studies is that Aristophanes' comic treatment of the deities has its germ in the literary and popular tradition of the various gods and the surnames attached to them in religious observances, which nobody will deny. But the real point is the spirit in which Aristophanes makes these assaults upon the personages of the Greek Pantheon.

The next observation of Professor PASCAL's conclusion has been anticipated, and no one will be startled when he goes on to say that Aristophanes, like so many other men of antiquity, takes an exclusively political view of religion. Hence his implacable satire against alien gods. In this regard as in others Aristophanes is a chauviniste. But I cannot agree with Professor PASCAL in thinking this chauvinism a proof of his disputed Athenian origin. There is such a thing as being more royalist than the King, of being more Southern than Southerners born.

But the charm of the subject has carried me beyond the limits of *Brief Mention*. Aristophanes is always an interesting theme,

and PASCAL's book is an interesting book. The author takes us through some of the most amusing scenes of Aristophanes. He is pleasant company and I am not going to point out the lapses of the *cicerone*. Indeed, how indulgent I am may be seen in the fact that I kept on reading after I reached p. 148, where one finds the astounding statement that the Protagoras of Plato is undoubtedly earlier than the Birds of Aristophanes. It is the case of poor Placido Cesareo over again (A. J. P. XXIII 446; cf. XXX 358). There must be something bewildering in the air of Sicily.

More than forty years ago I wrote:

The whole body of our literature is penetrated with classical allusions. In the *Märchen* of Goethe the will-o'-wisps 'with their peaked tongues dexterously licked out the gold veins of the colossal figure of the composite king to its very heart, and when at last the very tenderest filaments were eaten out, the image crashed suddenly together'. And some such fate would overtake our higher culture if the golden threads of antique poetry and philosophy were withdrawn. (*Essays and Studies*, p. 44.)

These words come back to me as I turn over the pages of the new edition of Professor GAYLEY's standard work *Classic Myths in English Literature and Art* (Ginn and Co.). These classic myths belong to the gold veins of our literature, a composite colossus, if ever there was one. For him who knows them already it is a joy to trace them in Professor GAYLEY's book. For those who do not, he has provided welcome and adequate guidance. And yet one always misses something. The paucity of references to Pindar stirred in me again the desire that some one would do for him what has been done for other great poets, and note the impress of his lonely genius on modern poetry. The Pindarists, needless to say, are not Pindaric, just as the *schema Pindaricum* is practically a misnomer (A. J. P. XI 182). Professor GAYLEY has given us the every day references to the Islands of the Blessed and to Pelops and Hippodameia, but Pindar would have been mortified to find that he clave to Herakles in vain and that the splendid First Nemean is not cited, nor the Third Olympian with its profoundly significant account of the Founding of the Olympic Games.

With his infallible instinct for popular demand the author of the *Grundriss zur Geschichte der Klassischen Philologie* has laid us all under obligations by the publication of his *Imagines Philologorum* (Teubner), a collection of 160 effigies of famous scholars from the fifteenth century down to our time. The diligence with which Professor GUDEMAN has brought together these likenesses, some of which were very hard to procure, is

worthy of all praise, and the book will have its place in every scholar's library. To be sure, when it comes down to my day and to men whom I have known personally, I must confess to a feeling of disappointment here and there. Ritschl is fairly well represented by the well-known lithograph of Hohnneck. Welcker is barely recognizable. Boeckh is not my Boeckh as he appears in the fine portrait by Begas, which is not very well reproduced in Sandys. Bekker is almost a caricature, though it serves to illustrate the anecdote told in A. J. P. XXVIII 113. Carl Friedrich Hermann is poor. The sketch of Weil is artistic and may be considered symbolical, but those who wish to see the man as he was when first I knew him will find him to the life in the photogravure accompanying Perrot's tribute (A. J. P. XXXII 118). There are better representations of Usener's handsome features easily accessible. And so on and so on. But on the whole it is an exceedingly valuable and suggestive collection, one which a scholar will be tempted to look at long and long, as Walt Whitman looked long and long at the animals. Unfortunately, beauty born of the murmuring sound of Greek and Latin has not passed into the faces of many of our guild, and we must sadly say of this one and that one as Pindar said of Melissos:—
ὄνοτος μὲν ἰδέσθαι, συμπεσεῖν δ' ἀκμῇ βαρύς.

Two eminent scholars among my correspondents have come to the defence of Browning in the matter of the sex of St. Praxed (A. J. P. XXXI 488). The line of defence is the same. The Bishop's mind is wandering and he has mixed up Christ and St. Praxed. He had previously spoken of the 'Saviour in His Sermon on the Mount, Saint Praxed in a glory', and now tries to combine the two. Hence the confusion of sexes which could hardly be laid to the charge of the Bishop when in his sober senses. 'It is bad art', says one of my correspondents. 'It is worse than a blunder. It is a crime', as all supersubtlety is. However, in the eyes of the Browning worshippers, the smudge, as I called it, has been turned into a halo and I take shame to myself for idly repeating a criticism that followed hard upon the publication of the poem. But after all I console myself with the thought that I suppressed an audacious comment on a notorious word which smirches the skirt of Pippa Passes. Let others decide the question of Browning's responsibility—by the light of Aristophanes' Apology. God is in his heaven, all's <wrong> with the <word> and I resume my study of the new edition of the scholia to Lykophron.

Forty-five years ago I took the census of the Latin Grammars in common use, and not only in this country, and was amazed to

find how often the unscholarly 'amaturus esse', 'amatus esse' occurred in the paradigm of the verb. He who writes thus may have a soul for the infinite. He has no feeling for the infinitive. And so I uttered my voice as of one crying in what Dr. Gudeman (A. J. P. XXXI 113) considers the philological wilderness of the United States (L. G.³, § 420), but to small purpose, if I may judge by the last Short Method with the Latin language I have seen. And what wonder when a man like Van Leeuwen on Eccl. 371 writes *πλυνὸς γίγνεσθαι*.

H. L. W: In view of the well-known difficulty of finding American houses willing to undertake the publication of scholarly works of elaborate character, it is gratifying to observe that European publishers are more ready than they once were to give to the world in monumental form works of high grade from the pen of American scholars. Under the title of *Palaeographia Iberica*, Professor JOHN M. BURNAM of the University of Cincinnati is soon to issue in Paris at the press of Honoré Champion a collection of facsimiles of manuscripts and documents in Latin and the Romance languages of Spain and Portugal. These facsimiles, taken from manuscripts of the principal libraries of Europe, will be accompanied by transcriptions, together with a bibliographical and palaeographical commentary, and will form a welcome addition to the apparatus of the student of the Visigothic hand, who has hitherto depended chiefly on the collection of Ewald and Loewe for purposes of illustration. From the point of view of the Romance scholar the new work will have even a greater value; for it is the first to furnish the palaeographer with facsimiles of manuscripts in Portuguese and the first of any importance to present such illustrative material in Spanish. The collection will appear in a limited edition of three hundred numbered copies and will consist of fifteen parts of about twenty plates each at a total cost of 375 francs. Professor BURNAM is to be heartily congratulated on the completion of this important work, which will soon take its place in the great libraries of the world as a worthy monument of American scholarship.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. Lemcke & Buechner, 30-32 W. 27th St., New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN AND ENGLISH.

Burton (H. E.) A Latin grammar. New York, *Silver, Burdett*, 1911. 13+337 pp. 12°, 90 c.

Caesar's Conquest of Gaul; being pt. 1 of the larger work, by T. Rice Holmes. New York, *Macmillan*, 1911. 36+184 pp. 1l. 8°, \$2 net.

Caesar and Nepos; for sight reading. New York, *American Book Co.* 170-247+118 pp. 12°, 80 c.

D'Ooge (B. L.) Latin for beginners. Boston, *Ginn*, 1911. 12+348 pp. 12°, \$1.

Grundy (G. B.) Thucydides and the History of his Age. London, 1911. 572 pp. 8°, 16s. net.

Mendel (C. W.) Sentence connection in Tacitus. New York, *Yale University*, 1911. 158 pp. 8°, \$1.25.

Mierow (C. C.) The essentials of Latin syntax; based on Caesar and Livy. Boston, *Ginn*, 1911. 6+98 pp. 12°, 90 c.

Petronius (*Bellum Civile*). With Commentary and Translation by Florma T. Baldwin. New York (*Columbia University Press*), *Lemcke & Buechner*, 1911. 264 pp. 12°, \$1.25 net.

Shewan (Alx.) The Lay of Dolon (The tenth Book of the Iliad), some Notes of its Language, Verse, and Contents. London and New York, *Macmillan*, 1911. 330 pp. 8°, 10s. net, \$3.25.

Wetmore (M. N.) Index verborum Vergilianus. New Haven, Ct., *Yale University Press*, 1911. 10+554 pp. 8°, \$4 net.

Wodehouse (S. C.) English-Greek Dictionary. London and New York, *Dutton*, 1910. 1038 pp. 8°, 15s. net, \$5.

Xenophon. Xenophon's Anabasis. Bks. 1-4; ed. by M. W. Mather and J. W. Hewitt. Text ed. New York, *American Book Co.* Pap., 40 c.

FRENCH.

Bulletin annuel d'épigraphie grecque publ. par A. J. Reinach, 2^e année 1908-1909, in-8°. *E. Leroux*. 2 fr. 50.

Cagnat (R.) et Besnier (M.) L'Année épigraphique romaine. Année 1910 (fasc. 23), in-8°. *E. Leroux*. 3 fr. 50.

Carra de Vaux (B.) La langue étrusque. In-12. 5 fr.

Collignon (Max). Les statues funéraires dans l'art grec, ill., 1 pl., in-4°. *E. Leroux*. 30 fr.

Euripide. Œuvres complètes, trad. par Leconte de Lisle. T. I, in-18. *A. Lemerre*. 3 fr. 50.

Havet (L.) Manuel de critique verbale appliquée aux textes latins. Paris, 1911. 4°. 50 fr.

Inscriptiones graecae ad res romanas pertinentes, auctoritate et impensis academiae inscriptionum et litterarum humaniorum collectae et editae. Tomus IV. Asia, fasc. 3. Curavit R. Cagnat, auxiliante G. Lafaye. (S. 193-288). Lex. 8°. Paris, *E. Leroux*, 1910. nn 2.

Montelius (Osc.) La civilisation primitive en Italie depuis l'introduction des métaux. II^e partie. Italie centrale. Texte I. Stockholm und Berlin, 1910. Sp. 540-1024. Mit Abbildgn. 8°. 30 m.

Platon. Phédon; trad. de F. Thurot avec le texte grec par E. Sommer (199 pp.), in-16. *Hachette et C^{ie}*. 1 fr. 60.

Waddington (W. H.) E. Babelon et Th. Reinach. Recueil général des monnaies grecques d'Asie Mineure. T. I, fasc. 3. Nicée et Nicomédie, 34 pl., in-4°. *E. Leroux*. 40 fr.

GERMAN.

Arrian's Anabasis, in Auswahl v. Geo. Heldrich. 2 Tle. 8°. Wien, *N. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1911. geb. je 1.75. 1. Tl. Einleitung u. Text. (114 S.) 2. Tl. Erklärende Anmerkungen u. Wörterbuch. (134 S.)

Billleter (Gust.) Die Anschauungen vom Wesen des Griechentums. (xviii, 477 S.) gr. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1911. 12; geb. in Leinw. 13.

Cicero's u. seiner Zeitgenossen ausgewählte Briefe. Bearb. u. f. die Schule erklärt v. Alois Kornitzer. (x, 113 u. 52 S.) 8°. Wien, *C. Gerold's Sohn*, 1910. geb. in Leinw. 2. 40.

Dietrich (Rud.) Collectanea zu Artemidorus Daldianus. 1. Tl. (20 S.) 8°. Rudolstadt, *Müller*, 1911. 1.

Διονυσίου ἢ Λογγίνου Περὶ ὑφους. Ed. Otto Iahn a. MDCCCLVII. Quartum ed. a. MDCCCX Ioa. Vahlen. (xxii, 94 S.) gr. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1911. 2.80; geb. 3.20.

Dissertationes philologicae Halenses. Vol. XVIII. gr. 8°. Halle, *M. Niemeyer*. Pars 4. Ziemann (Ferd.) De epistularum graecarum formulis sollemnibus quaestiones selectae. (lii, vii u. S. 253-369.) 1911. 3.60.

— dasselbe. Vol. XX. gr. 8°. Ebd. Pars 1. Sittig (Ernest). De Graecorum nominibus theophoris. (xi, 167 S.) 1911. 5.

Euripides. Andromache. Mit erklär. Anmerkgn. v. N. Wecklein. (91 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1911. 1.60; geb. 2.

Feyerabend (Karl). A pocket-dictionary of the Greek and English lan-

guages. 1. part. Greek-English. (xii, 419 S.) kl. 8°. Berlin-Schöneberg, *Langenscheidt's Verl.*, 1911. geb. in Leinw. 2.

Gall (Rob.) Lateinisches Lesebuch. 2 Tle. 8°. Wien, *F. Deuticke*. geb. in Leinw. 3.90.

Ganzenmüller (Carl). Die Elegie Nux u. ihr Verfasser. (87 S.) gr. 8°. Tübingen, *J. J. Heckenhauer*, 1910. 3.

Gruhn (Alb.) Der Schauplatz der Ilias u. Odyssee. 10. Heft. Äolus, Lästrygonen, Kirke, Aïdes, Albanien. (248 S.) 1911. 6. Lex. 8°. Friedrichshagen-Berlin (Westend 5), *Selbstverlag*.

Harder (Christian). Lateinisches Lesebuch f. Realanstalten. 1. Tl. Text. 8°. Wien, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1911. geb. in Leinw. 2.

Klassiker des Altertums. 1. Reihe. München, *G. Müller*. 3. 4. Herodotus. 2 Bde. (vii, 408 u. v, 441 S.) 1911. Einzelpr. 10.

Kornitzer (Alois). Lateinisches Übungsbuch f. Obergymnasien. Umgearb. Aufl. (255 S.) 8°. Wien, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1910. geb. in Leinw. 3.

Leben, Antikes, in Briefen. Eine Auswahl aus der röm. Briefliteratur. Hrag. von Alex. v. Gleichen-Russwurm (II, 380 S. m. 4 Bildnissen.) kl. 8°. Berlin, *J. Bard*, 1911. kart. 5; geb. in Ldr. n 7.

Livius. Auswahl aus der 3. Dekade. Bearb. v. Jhs. Teuffer. Text. (viii, 306 S. m. 4 farb. Karten.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1911. geb. in Halbleinw. 2.20.

Ludwich (Arth.) Anekdoten zur griechischen Orthographie. XII. Progr. (S. 341-373.) gr. 8°. Königsberg, *Akadem. Buchh. v. Schubert & Seidel*, 1911. b 35.

Nonni Panopolitani Dionysiacae. Recensuit Arth. Ludwich. Vol. II libros XXV-XLVIII continens. (iv, 556 S.) Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. kl. 8°. Lipsiae, 1911. 6.60; geb. in Leinw. 7.20.

Platon's Protagoras. Theaitetos. Ins Deutsche übertr. v. K. Preisendanz. (268 S.) 8°. Jena, *E. Diederichs*, 1910. 5; geb. n 6.50.

Plutarch. Auswahl, v. Herm. Schickinger. (2 Tle.) 2. Tl. Erklärende Anmerkgn. (192 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*. Wien, *F. Tempsky*, 1911. geb. 1.50.

Poetae latini minores. Post Aem. Baehrens iterum recensuit Frider. Vollmer. Vol. II, fasc. 1. Ovidi halienticon libri I fragmentum. Gratti cynegeticon libri I fragmentum. (53 S.) kl. 8°. Lipsiae, 1911. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. 60; geb. in Leinw. n 85.

Schroeder (Otto). Horazens Versmasse. (vi, 26 S.) kl. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1911. 60.

Studien zur Geschichte u. Kultur des Altertums. gr. 8°. Paderborn, *F. Schöningh*. IV. Bd. 3. Heft. Kessler (Jos.) Isokrates u. die panhellenische Idee. (86 S.) 1911. 2.60. IV. Bd. 4. Heft. Patin (Alois). Ästhetisch-kritische Studien zu Sophokles. (vii, 120 S.) 1911. 3.60.

Tacitus. Der Rednerdialog. Für den Schulge. hrsg. v. Herm. Röhl. 2 Tle. 8°. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*. Wien, *F. Tempsky*, 1911. geb. je. 75. I. Text. (51 S.) II. Kommentar. (74 S.)

Teichmüller (Fd.) Das Nischthorazische in der Horazüberlieferung. Berlin, *E. Hofmann*, 1911. 8°. 304 pp. 6 m.

Traube (L.) Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen. 2. Bd. Einleitung in die lateinische Philologie des Mittelalters. Herausg. von P. Lehmann. München, 1910. 8°. IX, 176 pp. 8 m.

Viedebantt (Osc.) Quaestiones Epiphanianae metrologicae et criticae. Leipzig, 1911. 8°. X, 140 pp. Mit. 6 Taf. 6 m.

Xenophon. Das Gastmahl. Verdeutsch von B. v. Hagen. (58 S. m. 1 Taf.) 8°. Jena, *E. Diederichs*, 1911. 2m.; geb. 3 m.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

About Edwin Drood. By H. J. Cambridge, *At the University Press*, 1911.

Aristophanes. Die Frösche. Mit ausgewählten antiken Schollen. Herausg. v. Wilhelm Süss. Kleine Texte für theologische u. philosophische Vorlesungen u. Uebungen. 66. Bonn, *A. Marcus u. E. Weber*, 1911. 2 m.

Baskervill (Charles Read). English Elements in Jonson's Early Comedy. (Bulletin of the University of Texas; Humanistic Series, No. 12. Studies in English, No. 1.) Austin, Texas, *University of Texas*, April 8, 1911.

Blümner (Hugo). Die römischen Privat-Altertümer mit 86 Abbildungen (Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft). Herausg. v. I. v. Müller. Vierter Bd. 2. Abt., 2. Teil. München, *Oskar Beck*, 1911. 12m..

Boas (Franz). Handbook of American Indian Languages. Part I. With illustrative sketches by Dixon, Goddard, Jones, Michelson, Thalbitzer. Smithsonian Institution (Bureau of American Ethnology). Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1911.

Burton (H. E.) A Latin Grammar. New York, *Silver, Burdett & Co.* 90 c.

Butler (N. M.) The Revolt of the Unfit. Reprinted from the Educational Review, February, 1911.

Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the John Rylands Library, Manchester. Vol. I. Literary Texts. Nos. 1-61. Ed. by Arthur S. Hunt. With ten plates. Manchester, *At the University Press*, 1911.

Columbia University Lectures. Lectures on Literature. New York, *Columbia University Press*: Sales Agents, Lemcke & Buechner, 1911.

Corneli Nepotis Vitae. Ed. Geo. Andresen. 2. Aufl. Für d. Schulgebr. bearb. v. R. Franz. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*: Wien, *F. Tempsky*, 1908. Geb. 1 m. 20 pf.

Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. Ed. consilio et impensis Academiae Litterarum Caesareae Vindobonensis. Vol. LVII. S. Aureli Augustini Operum Sectio II. S. Augustini Epistulae (Pars. IV). Ex Recensione Al. Goldbacher. Vindobonae, *F. Tempsky*: Lipsiae, *G. Freytag*, MCCCCXI. 21 m.

Demisch (Edwin). Die Schuldenerbfolge im attischen Recht. (Münchener diss.) Borna-Leipzig, *Robert Noske*, 1910.

Diehl (E.) Die Vitae Vergilianae u. ihre antiken Quellen. Herausg. v. E. D. (Kleine Texte 72.) Bonn, *A. Marcus u. E. Weber*, 1911. 1 m. 50 pf.

Dihigo (Juan M.) La fonetica experimental en la ciencia del lenguaje. Publicada en la Revista de la Facultad de Letras y Ciencias de la Universidad de Habana. Habana, 1911.

ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΥ Η ΔΟΓΜΑΤΩΝ ΠΕΡΙ ΤΥΟΤΕ. De Sublimitate libellus. In Usus Scholarum ed. O. Iahn. Quartum ed. Io. Vahlen. Lipsiae, In Aedibus G. B. Teubner, MDCCCXI.

Dittmar (Armin). Syntaktische Grundfragen. Prog. No. 763, 1911. Grimma, *Frdr. Bode*, 1911.

Eastern and Western Review. February, March, April, 1911. (Vol. III, Nos. 10-12. Per ann. \$1.) *Greek-American Publishing Co.*, Boston, Mass.

Edgerton (Franklin). The K-Suffixes of Indo-Iranian. (J. H. U. Diss.) Leipzig, *W. Drugulin*, 1911.

Ellis (Havelock). The World of Dreams. Boston and New York, *Houghton Mifflin Co.*, 1911. \$2.

English Dictionary, The Oxford. Ed. by Sir James A. H. Murray. Scouring-Sedum (Vol. VIII). By Henry Bradley. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*: New York, *Henry Frowde*. \$1.25.

Feyerabend (Karl). A Pocket Dictionary of the Greek and English Languages. First Part. Greek-English. Toussaint-Langenscheidt Method. Berlin, *Schöneberg-Langenscheidtsche Verlagsbuchhandlung*, 1910. 2 m.

Γαρίκα (Γ. Κ.) Πραγματεία περὶ τῶν εἰς -ΙΚΟΣ ἐπιθέτων, περὶ τῶν εἰς ΙΟΝ καὶ ΕΙΩΝ οὐσιαστικῶν καὶ περὶ τῆς σημασίας καὶ τοῦ τύπου τοῦ β. μελαγχολῶν. Ἀνατύψεις ἐκ τῆς Ἐπετηρίδος τοῦ Ἐθν. Πανεπιστημίου. ἐν Αθήναις. Σακέλλάριος, 1910.

Gayley (Charles Miles). The Classic Myths in English Literature and Art, accompanied by an Interpretative and Illustrative commentary. New ed., Revised and Enlarged. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1911. \$1.60.

Harrington (K. P.) Live Issues in Classical Study. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1910. 75 c.

Harry (Joseph Edward). The Antigone of Sophocles. Translated into English Verse. Cincinnati, *The Robert Clarke Co.*, 1911. \$1.

Hermes. Zeitschrift für classische Philologie. Herausg. v. F. Leo u. C. Robert. XLVI. Band, 2. Heft. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1911.

Heyse (Paul). L'Arrabbiata, Novelle. Ed. with Introductory Notes, Exercises, and a Vocabulary by Steven T. Byington. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1911. 30 c.

Hinke (W. J.) Selected Babylonian Kudurru Inscriptions. Semitic Study Series. No. XIV. Lelden, *E. J. Brill*: New York, *G. E. Stechert & Co.*, 1911.

Imagines Philologorum. 160 Bildnisse aus der Zeit von der Renaissance bis zur Gegenwart. Gesammelt u. herausg. v. Alfred Gudeman. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1911. Kart, 3 m. 20 pf.

Körner (Joseph). Nibelungenforschungen der deutschen Romantik. Untersuchungen zur neueren Sprach- u. Literaturgeschichte. Herausg. v. Oskar F. Walzel. N. F. IX Heft. Leipzig, *H. Haessel*, 1911.

Lateinisches Lesebuch für Realanstalten. Bearb. v. Christian Harder. 1. Teil. Text. Wien, *F. Tempsky*; Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1911. Geb. 2 m.

Lesebuch aus Platon. Mit einem Anhang aus Aristoteles. Für d. Schulgebr. herausg. v. Gustav Schneidewin. II. Erläuterungen. Wien, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1911. Geb. 1 m. 80 pf.

Marouzeau (S.) La phrase à verbe "être" en latin. Paris, *Paul Genthner*, 1910.

McBryde (John M.) Brer Rabbit in the Folk-Tales of the Negro and Other Races. Reprinted from the Sewanee Review for April, 1911. Sewanee, Tenn., *University Press*.

Μελέτη ('H.) Μηνιαῖον δημοσίευμα, 'Ιαν. 1911. ἐν 'Αθήναις. @ 1 δρχ.

Mierow (C. C.) The Essentials of Latin Syntax. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1910. 90 c.

Migeod (F. W. H.) The Languages of West Africa. Volume 1. London, *Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.*, 1911. 12s. 6d.

Milhailearu (Petre). Fragmentele Latine ale lui Philumenus și Philagrius mit einer Vorrede: Die lateinischen Fragmente des Philumenus u. Philagrius. Bukarest, 1910.

Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte u. deutsche Literatur u. für Pädagogik. Herausg. v. J. Ilberg u. Hernard Gerth. Vierzehnter Jahrg. XXVII u. XXVIII. Bandes 3 Heft. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1911.

Nixon (Paul). A Roman Wit. Epigrams of Martial rendered into English by Paul Nixon. Boston, *Houghton, Mifflin Co.*, 1911.

Ollphant (S. G.) An Interpretation of Ranae 788-90. Reprinted from the Transactions of the American Philological Association, Vol. XL, 1909.

Owen (E. I.) The Relations Expressed by the Passive Voice. Reprinted from Vol. XVII, Part 1, of the Transactions of the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts and Letters, July, 1910.

Pascal (Carlo) Epicurei e Mistici. Catania, Francesco Battiato, 1911. 2 L.

Petronius. The Bellum Civile. Ed. with Introduction, Commentary, and Translation by Florence Theodora Baldwin. New York, *The Columbia University Press*; *Lemcke & Buechner*, 1911.

Poetarum Romanorum Veterum Reliquiae: Selegit E. Diehl. (Kleine Texte, 69.) Bonn, *A. Marcus u. E. Weber*, 1911. 2 m. 50 pf.

Πρακτικά τῆς ἐν 'Αθήναις 'Αρχαιολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας τοῦ ἔτους 1909. 'Αθήνησιν, 1910.

Reay (Lord). The Late President, Mr. S. H. Butcher, M. P. From the Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. V.

Revista de la Facultad de Letras y Ciencias, Universidad de la Habana. Noviembre de 1910. Vol. XI. Num. 3. Enero de 1911. Vol. XII. Num. 1.

Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. Herausg. von August Brinkmann. N. F. LXVI 1. Frankfurt a. M., J. D. Sauerlander's Verlag, 1911.

Schanz (Martin). Geschichte der römischen Litteratur. Zweiter Teil. Die römische Litteratur in der Zeit der Monarchie bis auf Hadrian, Erste Hälfte: Die augustische Zeit. Dritte, gänzl. umgearbeitete u. verm. Auflage. (Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, herausg. v. I. v. Müller. Achter Bd. Zweiter Teil. 2. Abt. 1. Hälfte.) München, Oskar Beck, 1911. 10 m.

Scheindlers Lateinische Uebungsbücher für die II. Klasse der Realgymnasien u. Gymnasien. Von Aug. Scheindler. Wien, F. Tempsky: Leipzig, G. Freytag, 1911. 2 m. 60 pf.

Scheindler (Aug.) Lateinische Schulgrammatik. Herausg. v. R. Kauer. 8te Ausg. Wien, F. Tempsky, 1910.

Schiller's Wilhelm Tell. Ed. with Introduction, Notes and Repetitional Exercises by Bert John Vos. Boston, Ginn & Co., 1911.

Semple (William S.) Authenticity and Sources of the Origo Gentis Romanae. University Studies, Series II, Vol. VI, No. 3. Cincinnati, University Press, Sept., Oct., 1910.

Shewan (Alexander). The Lay of Dolon (The Tenth Book of the Iliad). Some Notes on its Language, Verse and Contents. With Remarks by the way on the Canons and Methods of Homeric Criticism. London and New York, Macmillan & Co., 1911. \$3.25.

Sihler (E. G.) Annals of Caesar. New York, Stechert & Co., 1911. \$1.75.

Skeat (Walter W.) A Concise Etymological Dictionary. New and Corrected Edition. Oxford, At the Clarendon Press, 1911. 5s.

Sophokles' Philoktetes von Friedrich Schubert. Dritte gänzl. umgearbeitete Aufl. v. L. Hüter. Leipzig, G. Freytag: Wien, F. Tempsky, 1908. Geb. 1 m. 20 pf.

Steele (R. B.) Ut, Ne, Quin and Quominus in Livy. Leipzig, Brockhaus, 1911.

Steiner u. Scheindler's Lateinisches Lese- u. Uebungsbuch. III u. IV Teil. Herausg. v. R. Kauer. Wien, F. Tempsky, 1910. Geb. @ 2 kr.

Tacitus, Der Rednerdialog. Für d. Schulgebr. herausg. v. H. Röhl. I. Teil: Der Text. Leipzig, G. Freytag: Wien, F. Tempsky, 1911. 75 pf.

Valentini (R.) Di un' Antologia Valerio-Gelliana del sec. XII. Estr. Riv. Classici e Neolatini, n. 4. a. VI, 1910. Aosta, Marguerretaz, 1910.

Wagenwoort (H.) De Horatii quae dicuntur odia Romanis. (Spec. Inaug.) Groningae, MCMXI.

Wright (F. Warren). Studies in Menander. (Princeton Diss.) Bryn Mawr, The Author, 1911. \$1.